BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dissertation

THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION IN THE CHRONICLER'S WORK AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

by

Robert Grant Rogers

(B.S., Ohio State University, 1960; S.T.B., Boston University, 1963)

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

1969

APPROVED

by

First Reader H Neil Richardson
Professor of Old Testament

Second Reader Harrell Frederick Beck
Professor of Old Testament

THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION IN THE CHRONICLER'S WORK AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

(Order No._____)

Robert Grant Rogers, Ph.D.
Boston University Graduate School, 1969

Major Professor: H. Neil Richardson, Professor of Old Testament

The purpose of this dissertation is to compare the Chronicler's work and the Dead Sea Scrolls regarding the doctrine of election and its Hebrew vocabulary. The questions posed are: (1) Is the Chronicler's doctrine of election more or less inclusive than that of the Dead Sea Scrolls? (a) Who is considered to be elect? (b) Who is excluded from being elect? (c) How does one become elect? (2) Does the Chronicler's doctrine of election differ from that of the Dead Sea Scrolls with respect to the following aspects of election? (a) Through whom are the promises of election traced? (b) By what basic concept is the belief in election expressed? (c) What is the ultimate fate of the elect and the non-elect?

The Essenes expressed their understanding of election more times through a greater variety of verbal and nominal forms than did the Chronicler or the writers of his sources. One-third of the total occurrences of potential election vocabulary in the Chronicler's work pertains to election. In the scrolls, this proportion is one-half. The average ratio of relevant election vocabulary occurrences to total vocabulary occurrences (election and non-election vocabulary) is greater in the scrolls than in the Chronicler's work (2.5% and 1.2%, respectively). Nineteen verbal and nominal forms are used to express the doctrine of election in the Chronicler's

work. The corresponding number in the Qumran literature is twenty-two. The writers of the scrolls gave a new dimension to the nouns אביון, סוד, and יחד. These words are not part of the Old Testament vocabulary of election.

The doctrine of election in the Chronicler's work is more inclusive than that in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the former, there is an ambiguity about the identity of the elect and the non-elect. (Gentiles are non-elect in both literatures.) There is an obvious reticence to define Israelites as non-elect although certainly this is the implication suggested in Ezra and Nehemiah 7-10 with regard to those who ignored the dictums of the returned exiles. (Ezra and Nehemiah 7-10 reflect a more exclusivistic understanding of the elect than is found in the remainder of the Chronicler's work.) In the Qumran literature (with the exception of 4QDibHam) the majority of references to the non-elect are aimed at Judeans who were not members of the sect. Only the Essenes are considered to be elect. In the Chronicler's work, ethnicity alone is often sufficient justification for inclusion in the elect group. In the Qumran literature, "conversion" and extensive preparation are necessary before the would-be member is admitted to the elect group.

A significant difference between the Chronicler's composition and the Qumran scrolls is the use in the latter of the Sons of Zadok and the Teacher of Righteousness as instruments through whom the promises of election are traced. Neither of these has an exact corresponding counterpart in the work of the Chronicler.

The covenant is the primary means of expressing the fact of election in both literatures. The tight community structure of the Essenes contributed to the relative immutability of their covenant. The various covenants in the Chronicler's work represent adaptations to changing conditions. These covenants were never so all-embracing in the life of the community as that of the Essenes.

The Essenes were much more concerned about the future than were the various writers in the Chronicler's work. In the scrolls, the fate of the elect and the non-elect is carefully articulated. The terrible fate of the non-elect is particularly graphic. The writers of the canonical work show little sustained interest in the fate of the non-elect.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

- Statement of the Problem
- Definitions
- Limitations
- Previous Research in the Field
- The Method of the Dissertation

II. ANALYSIS OF THE LITERATURE TO BE EXAMINED 16

- The Chronicler's Composition
  - Historical Setting
  - Sources Used
  - Relationship to Old Testament Canon
- The Dead Sea Scrolls
  - Date of the Scrolls
  - Relationship to the Essenes
  - Relationship to the Zadokite Document
  - Relationship of the Essenes to Palestinian Judaism

III. THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION AND ITS VOCABULARY. 88

- The Vocabulary of Election in Current Debate
  - Vriezen's Emphasis on the Centrality of בחר
  - Koch's Emphasis on the "Wort-feld" of בחר
  - Altmann's Critique of Vriezen and Koch
  - Other Positions on the Doctrine of Election and Its Vocabulary
  - Summary
- The Basic Vocabulary of the Doctrine of Election
  - Verbal Forms
  - Nominal Forms
  - Relationship of Verbal to Nominal Forms
- The Doctrine of Election Prior to the Chronicler
  - Deuteronomy
  - Second Isaiah

IV. THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION IN THE CHRONICLER'S WORK. . . 127

- Occurrences of Election Vocabulary
- Identification of the Elect and the Non-Elect
  - Who is Considered Elect?
  - Who is Excluded from Being Elect?
  - How does One Become Elect?
- Through Whom are the Promises of Election Traced?
- By What Basic Concept is the Belief in Election Expressed?
- Fate of the Elect and the Non-Elect

V. THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS . . . 167

- Occurrences of Election Vocabulary
- Identification of the Elect and the Non-Elect
  - Who is Considered Elect?
  - Who is Excluded from Being Elect?
  - How does One Become Elect?
- Through Whom are the Promises of Election Traced?
- By What Basic Concept is the Belief in Election Expressed?
- Fate of the Elect and the Non-Elect

VI. COMPARISON OF THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION IN BOTH LITERATURES 221

- Occurrences of Election Vocabulary
- Identification of the Elect and the Non-Elect
- Through Whom are the Promises of Election Traced?
- By What Basic Concept is the Belief in Election Expressed?
- Fate of the Elect and the Non-Elect

VII. CONCLUSIONS 237

APPENDIX 241

BIBLIOGRAPHY 246

VITA 259

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Occurrences of Specified Election Vocabulary in the Chronicler's Work (Verbal Forms) 241

2. Occurrences of Specified Election Vocabulary in the Chronicler's Work (Nominal Forms) 242

3. Occurrences of Specified Election Vocabulary in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Verbal Forms) 243

4. Occurrences of Specified Election Vocabulary in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Nominal Forms) 244

5. Comparison of Relevant Election Vocabulary Occurrences with Total Vocabulary Occurrences in the Chronicler's Work and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Verbal and Nominal Forms) 245

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

I. Primary Documents

1QpHab	Commentary on Habbakuk
1QS	Manual of Discipline
1QM	War Scroll
1QH	Hymn Scroll
CD	Damascus Document (Zadokite Document)
4QDibHam	Dibre Hammorot
1QSa	Rule of the Congregation
1QSb	Book of Blessings
22	Sayings of Moses
34	Book of Priestly Liturgies
4QpIsa	Commentary on Isaiah
4QpNah	Commentary on Nahum
4QpPs37	Commentary on Psalm 37
4QPB	Patriarchal Blessings
4QFl	Florilegium

II. Journals and Periodicals

BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
Bibl	*Biblica*
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Ryland's Library*

BR	Biblical Research
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
ET	The Expository Times
HThR	Harvard Theological Review
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
Interp	Interpretation
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JBR	Journal of Bible and Religion
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JThS	Journal of Theological Studies
NTS	New Testament Studies
OS	Oudtestamentische Studiën
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
RB	Revue Biblique
REJ	Revue des Études Juives
RQ	Revue de Qumran
SEA	Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok
SJTh	Scottish Journal of Theology
STh	Studia Theologica
ThL	Theologische Literaturzeitung
ThZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
VT	Vetus Testamentum
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZKTh	Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947, there has been much discussion about the importance of this find for our knowledge of the Old Testament and of Palestinian Judaism (in the first centuries B.C. and A.D.) as well as a consequent better understanding of the Jewish background of the New Testament. As a result of the scrolls, advances have been made in the fields of textual criticism, linguistic studies (including the development of Hebrew dialects and scripts), biblical theology, and intertestamental history.[1] Thus, there has been a renewed interest in the study of sectarian Judaism during the intertestamental period.[2] Scholars have also devoted much time to discerning possible doctrinal parallels between the scrolls and the New Testament.[3] A considerable amount of scholarly effort has been devoted to studies comparing the Dead Sea Scrolls with the Old Testament on a variety of levels--e.g., the use of parallel passages and central ideas common to both.[1] However, there has not been much emphasis to date on a systematic study of the same vocabulary as used in the Dead Sea Scrolls and specific portions of the Old Testament. More particularly, there has not been a careful comparison of the Chronicler's work and the Dead Sea Scrolls with regard to their use of the same vocabulary pertaining to the doctrine of election. The Chronicler's work has been chosen for comparison primarily because it was written at a time when the language of election had become fully developed in biblical Hebrew.[2] The authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls, of course, writing after the time of the Chronicler, also had access to the literature containing a fully developed language of election. Also significant for the purposes of this dissertation is the Chronicler's use of various sources which incorporate a variety of types of literature--a variety which compares rather favorably with the broad spectrum of types of literature included in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[3] In addition, the relative amount of material to be analyzed in each literature is also similar. The Chronicler's composition contains a total of approximately

---

[1] An excellent summary of the importance of the scrolls for all aspects of biblical studies is found in J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, trans. by J. Strugnell (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1959), pp. 129-43.

[2] Among the numerous treatments of the subject, the following seem especially helpful: Werner Förster, Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times, trans. by Gordon E. Harris (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1964); Marcel Simon, Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus, trans. by James H. Farley (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967); and Morton Smith, "The Dead Sea Sect in Relation to Ancient Judaism," NTS, VII (1960-61), 347-60.

[3] The following are representative of this work: Matthew Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961); Herbert Braun, Qumran und das Neue Testament (2 vols.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1966); and Frank Moore Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies (rev. ed.; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961), pp. 197-243.

---

[1] These works are typical: Matthew Black, "The Theological Conceptions of the Dead Sea Scrolls," SEA, XVIII-XIX (1953-54), 72-97; Millar Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: Viking Press, 1958), pp. 135-76; and Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 163-94.

[2] The process of the development of election vocabulary in the Old Testament will be discussed in chapter three.

[3] A full discussion of the Chronicler's sources and the types of literature included in the Dead Sea Scrolls is given in chapter two.

28,650 word occurrences.[1] For the Dead Sea Scrolls, the corresponding figure is approximately 22,800.[2]

The doctrine of election is a major theme in both the Chronicler and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The whole problem of how the particular religious community was to understand its relationship to deity vis-a-vis that of the rest of humanity to deity was of crucial importance throughout the post-exilic period. This concern for self-identity remains firmly embodied in the thought of rabbinic Judaism[3] and early Christianity.[4] Yet, to date, there has been no comparison of what may be called a "canonical interpretation" with a "sectarian interpretation" of a major biblical doctrine--e.g., election--to determine whether there is any difference between these two expressions of Judaism at this particular level of self-understanding. It is the purpose of this dissertation to undertake this comparison.

---

[1] I Chronicles 1-9 is not included in this total since that portion of the Chronicler's work is composed primarily of geneological lists which are of no value to the purposes of this dissertation. The reader is referred to the first section in chapter four and to Table 5 (Appendix) for further analysis of this total.

[2] The scrolls which are included in this total are as follows: 1QpHab, 1QS, 1QM, 1QH, CD, 4QDibHam, 22, 1QSa, 1QSb, 34, 4QpIsa, 4QpNah, 4QpPs37, 4QPB, and 4QFl. Other scrolls found at Qumran are not considered to contain relevant election vocabulary so as to justify inclusion in this total. Further information regarding this total is found in the first section of chapter five and in Table 5 (Appendix).

[3] There are numerous references to the doctrine of election in both the Mishnah and the Talmud; e.g., Horayoth 3:8, Makkoth 2:3; Yebamoth 6:5; 7:5 (all dealing with identification of the elect group and its privileges). See Phillip Blackman, Mishnayoth, Vol. VII: Supplement and Index (2nd ed. rev.; New York: The Judaica Press, Inc., 1964); and I. Epstein, ed., The Babylonian Talmud: Index Volume (London: The Soncino Press, 1952) for further references.

[4] Such passages as Luke 18:7; Romans 9:6-13; Col. 3:11-13; I Peter 2:9; Ignatius' Epistle to the Magnesians, x, demonstrate the early church's concern about the doctrine of election. The writings of Ignatius are found in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I: The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956).

It is the writer's intention to examine the vocabulary of the doctrine of election in the Chronicler and the Dead Sea Scrolls and to analyze the uses and meanings of specified identical words in these two bodies of literature. On the basis of this analysis, a judgment will be made on the following questions:

1. Is the Chronicler's doctrine of election more or less inclusive than that of the Dead Sea Scrolls?

This question will be considered in terms of the following criteria:

   a. Who is considered to be elect?
   b. Who is excluded from being elect?
   c. How does one become elect?

2. Does the Chronicler's doctrine of election differ from that of the Dead Sea Scrolls with respect to the following aspects of election?
   a. Through whom are the promises of election traced?
   b. By what basic concept is the belief in election expressed?
   c. What is the ultimate fate of the elect? What is the ultimate fate of the non-elect?

These questions and sub-questions are designed to explore various affirmations of the fact of election as well as to examine some of the implications of these affirmations.

Definitions

Amplified definitions of the following terms will be presented in subsequent chapters of the dissertation, but initially, the following are given as working definitions.

The Chronicler's work is taken to mean that portion of Old Testament literature comprising I-II Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. It is assumed that this literary work, as it is found in the Hebrew canon, represents the work of either one editor or a group of editors with essentially the same point of view.[1] A more complete statement about the Chronicler will be given in the second chapter.

The Dead Sea Scrolls are defined as that corpus of literature discovered in various caves in the vicinity of Khirbet Qumran from 1947 onward.[2] Variant terms for the Dead Sea Scrolls such as Qumran documents, Qumran literature, Qumran scrolls, or Essene literature[3] will be used interchangeably throughout the dissertation. A list of the scrolls (with their abbreviations) cited in this dissertation is given on p. x . References to the various scrolls are cited by column and line throughout the dissertation except for the document CD in which citation is done by chapter and line (following the standard system used by scholars). See chapter two for a complete analysis of the Qumran literature.

The doctrine of election is defined simply as the belief that God has chosen a particular people to have a special relationship to him, a relationship which is not experienced in equal measure by the rest of mankind. Several aspects of election follow from this unique privileged relationship. First, the chosen people see themselves as God's special possession in the world; God is always concerned about the welfare of his people. Second, the privilege of being chosen carries with it expressed duties and obligations. G. A. Danell emphasizes quite correctly that the ". . . solidarity of Yahweh with His people is never without condition. Stipulations are, on the contrary, made from the very beginning."[1] These stipulations are expressed in and through the covenant which is to be seen as the visible sign of the fact of election. The various facets of the doctrine of election, along with its Hebrew vocabulary, will be explored more completely in chapter three.

---

[1] This idea was suggested tentatively by some scholars in the Middle Ages. See Otto Zockler, The Books of the Chronicles, trans. by James G. Murphy (New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 1877), pp. 8-11, for a list of earlier scholars who favored the idea of a unified historical work in spite of the possible taint of heresy often ascribed to such bold affirmations. Most modern scholars accept the idea of an edited literary unit composed of various originally independent sources.

[2] See Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 3-30, for a succinct statement about the discovery of these scrolls.

[3] The use of this term presupposes that the Essenes wrote these scrolls. The proof for this contention will be offered in chapter two.

Limitations

The analysis of vocabulary will be limited to those words which are defined in chapter three as relevant to the doctrine of election.

No attempt will be made to compare specific emphases of the doctrine of election in either the Chronicler or the Dead Sea Scrolls with emphases of the doctrine of election as found in other portions of the Old Testament.[2] However, there will be a section in chapter three in which the major Old Testament traditions of election prior to the time of the Chronicler's work are briefly outlined. In this way witness will be made to the fact that the doctrine of election expressed in both the Chronicler's work and the Qumran documents had a history of development prior to its appearance in these literatures, and that this development included a consequent growth in the vocabulary of election of which the Chronicler and the writers of the scrolls were the direct heirs.

---

[1] G. A. Danell, "The Idea of God's People in the Bible," The Root of the Vine, ed. by Anton Fridrichsen et al. (London: Dacre Press, 1953), p. 28.

[2] Both the Chronicler and the Dead Sea Scrolls were influenced by various Old Testament themes (including election) developed prior to their writing. See Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. I, trans. by D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962), pp. 347-54; and Black, "Theological Conceptions," pp. 72 ff., for helpful treatments on the subject.

The analysis of specified election vocabulary will be limited to those instances in which reference is made to the community, or a special group within the community,[1] rather than to an individual[2] or to a place.[3] (The latter two are more typical of the Chronicler's work than of the Dead Sea Scrolls.) However, exceptions to this limitation will occur when the election promises allegedly made to a particular individual are appropriated in behalf of the entire community.

Examination of the Dead Sea Scrolls will be limited to non-biblical Hebrew texts. This means that the Aramaic text known as the Genesis Apocryphon and the various biblical texts[4] will be eliminated from consideration. Perusal of the variant readings in the biblical texts leads this writer to believe that none of them is of significance for this

---

[1] Thus, the Chronicler's references to the election of the Levites, for example, will be examined. References to the election of the priests ("Sons of Zadok") in the Dead Sea Scrolls will be cited also.

[2] References to the election of the Davidic dynasty (I Chr. 28:4; 29:1; II Chr. 6:6), for example, would be excluded from consideration.

[3] The most obvious example of this would be the election of Jerusalem (II Chr. 6:6; 12:13; 33:7; Neh. 1:9).

[4] These include the Isaiah scroll (1QIsa), the Samuel scroll (4QSam), and the Psalm scroll (11QPs) plus numerous other fragmentary manuscripts. The non-canonical psalms found in 11QPs are not relevant to this dissertation. Photographs and transcriptions of the biblical texts may be found in the various volumes of the series, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955 to date).

dissertation. (The biblical commentaries will, of course, be included in the analysis of texts.) In addition, the various fragments of the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha found at Qumran[1] will be eliminated from consideration. The problems involved in assigning authorship to the various pseudepigraphical works are well-known. It is by no means certain that any of these works was written by the Essenes. Therefore, examination of either the apocryphal or pseudepigraphical documents found at Qumran is of no value for this dissertation. Hence, the literature examined will represent the presumably original works[2] produced by the Qumran community rather than the works common to a broader segment of Palestinian Judaism.

Previous Research in the Field

No research projects which pertain directly to the research questions posed in this dissertation have been published. There are a number of studies of peripheral value to this dissertation which merit attention.

Several scholars have dealt with the doctrine of election as it appears in the Old Testament. One of the earliest studies was done by Kurt Galling.[3] His work deals particularly with the patriarchal traditions, especially the exodus and Sinai traditions, and the role they play in the development of the doctrine of election. For Galling, the doctrine of election is best symbolized in the Old Testament through the recording of particular historical events. Gerhard von Rad shares Galling's emphasis on "election traditions" which arise out of Israel's understanding of particular historical events.[1] A work by W. J. Phythian-Adams[2] also underscores Galling's approach. He calls attention to the role of the call of the chosen people, the deliverance from Egypt, and the covenant ratification at Sinai as the foci around which the election traditions of the Old Testament are gathered. More recently, H. H. Rowley[3] has emphasized the implications of the belief in election. He prefers to view election primarily from the standpoint of the obligations demanded of the chosen people; election and servanthood are synonymous in the Old Testament. "It is ever election for some purpose, and God ever chooses those who are best suited for His purpose."[4] While Galling, von Rad, Phythian-Adams, and Rowley are helpful in a general way because of their treatment of the election theme, their usefulness for this dissertation is limited severely by their lack of emphasis on the Hebrew vocabulary of the doctrine of election. It should also be mentioned that none of them deals specifically with the doctrine of election in the Chronicler except through incidental references.

---

[1] A full discussion of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings found at Qumran is available in Milik, Ten Years of Discovery, pp. 31-37.

[2] Scholars call this portion of the scrolls "sectarian literature." See Cross, Ancient Library, p. 44; and Milik, Ten Years of Discovery, p. 37.

[3] Kurt Galling, Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels (Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1928).

---

[1] Von Rad, Theology, I, 69-70 ff.

[2] W. J. Phythian-Adams, The Call of Israel: An Introduction to the Study of Divine Election (London: Oxford University Press, 1934).

[3] H. H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election (London: Lutterworth Press, 1950).

[4] Ibid., p. 39. Much the same emphasis is found in Danell, "The Idea of God's People," p. 28.

Somewhat more useful are the studies by Peter Altmann,[1] Nils Alstrup Dahl,[2] Klaus Koch,[3] D. W. Staerk,[4] and T. C. Vriezen.[5] All deal extensively with the Hebrew vocabulary of election in the Old Testament. A critique of these and other pertinent works will be given in chapter three. Here again, none of these studies deals specifically with the language of election in the work of the Chronicler.

There is, of course, a spate of references and allusions to the Old Testament doctrine of election in various Old Testament theologies. But these tend more to ascertain the significance of the doctrine of election in the Old Testament than to explore the doctrine in any great depth. Among the most helpful are works by Walther Eichrodt[6] and Edmond Jacob.[7] Eichrodt's approach to the Old Testament is to emphasize the predominant role of covenant (ברית) in the life of Israel. Nevertheless, he agrees with Galling *et al*. about the importance of the election theme as it relates to the interpretation of Israel's historical events. "Even where the word 'election' is not used, the thing itself is implied--as, for example, when the prophets speak of the redemption from Egypt or the gift of the land of Canaan."[1] Jacob devotes a section in his book to the doctrine of election in the Old Testament in which he deals briefly, but succinctly, with the language of election. He, too, emphasizes the close identification of election and historical traditions. However, since neither Eichrodt nor Jacob deals specifically with the doctrine of election in the Chronicler, their usefulness is limited.

---

[1] Peter Altmann, *Erwählungstheologie und Universalismus im Alten Testament* (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1964).

[2] Nils Alstrup Dahl, *Das Volk Gottes: Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums* (2nd ed.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963).

[3] Klaus Koch, "Zur Geschichte der Erwählungsworstellung in Israel," *ZAW*, LXVII (1955), 205-26.

[4] D. W. Staerk, "Zum alttestamentlichen Erwählungsglauben," *ZAW*, XIV (1937), 1-36.

[5] T. C. Vriezen, *Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament* (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1953).

[6] Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. by J. A. Baker (2 vols.; London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1961-67).

[7] Edmond Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. by Arthur W. Heathcote and Phillip J. Allcock (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1958).

The above studies represent the most pertinent work done on the doctrine of election in the Old Testament. It is appropriate at this point to review studies done on the doctrine of election in the Qumran scrolls.

To this writer's knowledge, there have been no comprehensive attempts to deal with the doctrine of election in the Dead Sea Scrolls. There are several articles on particular concepts in the Dead Sea Scrolls which are useful, in a general way, to the purposes of this dissertation. E. F. Sutcliffe has dealt briefly with attitudes of the Qumran community toward the non-elect.[2] Alfred Marx developed the theme of the relationship of the Qumran community to those Jews who were not members of the community.[3] In neither of these studies is there any emphasis on the Hebrew vocabulary of the particular concept being examined.

---

[1] Eichrodt, Theology, I, 369.

[2] E. F. Sutcliffe, "Hatred at Qumran," RQ, II (1959-1960), 345-56.

[3] Alfred Marx, "Y a-t-il une prédestination à Qumran?" RQ, VI (1967), 163-81.

This, plus the limited field of inquiry in each, limits the value for this dissertation.

A recent study by Leah Bronner deals with a particular aspect of election--the principle of "separatism"--as it pertains to the whole sectarian movement in late post-exilic Judaism.[1] Her treatment of the Qumran sect and the Essenes--she prefers to differentiate between these two[2]--is very limited; the bulk of the study deals with other sectarian groups. Her treatment of the doctrine of election is limited to a few scattered references. Consequently, the value of her study for this dissertation is minimal.

In summary, the main value of previous studies to the concerns of this dissertation lies in their usefulness in establishing the doctrine of election as a primary theme in Hebraic thought and in ascertaining the vocabulary of the doctrine of election. This writer knows of no prior attempt to compare the vocabulary of election in the Chronicler's work with that in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The Method of the Dissertation

In a dissertation of this type, in which a particular doctrine is being compared in two different bodies of literature, a primary task is to determine the nature of the literatures to be examined. This is the purpose of chapter two. The section on the Chronicler is designed to survey scholarly opinion regarding historical questions--the identity of the Chronicler, the date of his work; literary questions--the sources available to the Chronicler, the use made of these sources; and, finally, to establish the work of the Chronicler as a "canonical expression" within Judaism. The Qumran documents also require elucidation in those areas where there is serious controversy among scholars. The initial problem is to determine the date of the scrolls. Next, it must be determined what relationship exists between the group producing the Dead Sea Scrolls and the sect which Josephus labeled "the Essenes."[1] Then, it will be necessary to consider whether it is legitimate to include the Zadokite Document (Damascus Document) with the Dead Sea Scrolls for purposes of comparison with the work of the Chronicler. Finally, it is essential to examine Palestinian Judaism during the period when the Dead Sea Scrolls were written--to determine the place of the Qumran community in the total spectrum of Palestinian Jewish thought and to establish the scrolls as a "sectarian expression" within Judaism.

---

[1] Leah Bronner, Sects and Separatism during the Second Jewish Commonwealth (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1967).

[2] The problem of the relationship of the Essenes to the Dead Sea Scroll community will be examined in chapter two of this dissertation.

Having established the nature of the literature to be examined, the purpose of chapter three follows logically. It is to ascertain the bases for comparing the Chronicler's work and the Dead Sea Scrolls. This involves a critique of scholarly opinions on what constitutes the Hebrew vocabulary of the doctrine of election. An important aspect of this task is to determine both the verbal and the nominal expressions of election. Finally, by tracing the usage of the established vocabulary in exilic and post-exilic Old Testament literature, it will be possible to observe the themes and vocabulary of the doctrine of election of which the Chronicler and the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls were the heirs.[1]

---

[1] Josephus *Antiquities* XVIII, i; *War* II, viii. References to Josephus are found in T. E. Page *et al.*, gen. eds., *Josephus*, Vol. II, trans. by H. St. J. Thackeray; Vol. XI, trans. by Ralph Marcus (9 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951-58).

Chapters four and five are designed to present the results of research in the Chronicler and Qumran scrolls in a logical, concise fashion. A general summary of word occurrences will be given in each chapter based on an examination *in situ* of every occurrence of the verbal and nominal forms established in chapter three.[2] The sections which follow in each chapter are designed to categorize the findings in such a way as to facilitate the comparison of these findings in chapter six. Subject to the limitations imposed on the scope of this dissertation, representative samples of every Hebrew word pertaining to the doctrine of election will be analyzed. The second section of each chapter catalogues the election vocabulary with respect to the questions posed in the first major question. Sections three through five of each chapter catalogue the findings in exact relation to the order of questions listed as a part of the second major question.

The purpose of chapter six is two-fold: (1) to compare the election vocabulary usage in the Chronicler and the Dead Sea Scrolls; (2) to answer the research questions posed in chapter one of the dissertation.

---

[1] Note, though, the limitation on p. 6 of this chapter which emphasizes that the doctrine of election in the Chronicler's work and in the Dead Sea Scrolls will not be compared, per se, with the doctrine of election in other portions of the Old Testament.

[2] Among the concordances to be consulted are: Gerhard Lisowsky, ed., *Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament* (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1958); and Karl Georg Kuhn, *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960); "Nachtrage zur Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten," *RQ*, IV (1963-64), 163-234.

A brief concluding chapter will present an opportunity to estimate the value of this research for present-day scholarship in the biblical field and to point toward future research questions which arise from the conclusions drawn from the research of this dissertation.

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF THE LITERATURE TO BE EXAMINED

The Chronicler's Composition

It is with a feeling of real trepidation that one approaches a discussion of the Chronicler's composition. Although, to be sure, there is a general consensus among scholars regarding the "fact" of the existence of the Chronicler, there is wide-spread, often irreconcilable, disagreement as to the identity of the Chronicler, the date of his composition, the sources he used (and how he used them), the historical accuracy of his work, his purpose in writing, and the process by which his work came to be accepted as a part of the Old Testament canon. The words of one commentator attest to the present state of confusion.

> The present state of studies in the Chronicler's work may fairly be said to border on chaos. The scope, purpose, date, and historical value of this work are all subject to violent debate on the part of scholars who affirm exactly opposite conclusions in the strongest possible language.[1]

Despite this gloomy assessment of the current situation, an attempt will be made to lift up the major issues concerning the work of the Chronicler, to examine the major viewpoints clustered about these issues, and to make a judgment on the veracity of these major viewpoints. In this way, it is anticipated that the literature of the Chronicler will be seen from its own perspective. This is a task which properly precedes the actual examination of specific vocabulary in that literature.

---

[1] David Noel Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," CBQ, XXIII (1961), 436.

Historical Setting

Who was the Chronicler? When did he write? These two questions elicit greatly divergent responses as scholars seek to place the Chronicler and his work in an historical framework. As will be seen, affirmations about who the Chronicler was have a direct influence on conclusions about when he wrote. Proposals for the identity of the Chronicler range from Ezra or Nehemiah to an unknown person or group of persons writing from a unified perspective.

Those who would contend that either Ezra or Nehemiah was the Chronicler can claim the authority of ancient tradition. In Baba Bathra 15a (part of the Babylonian Talmud), the rhetorical question is raised: Who wrote the scriptures? The following answer is given:

> Ezra wrote the book that bears his name and the geneologies of the Books of Chronicles up to his own time. This confirms the opinion of Rab, since Rab Judah has said in the name of Rab: Ezra did not leave Babylon to go up to Eretz Yisrael until he had written his own geneology.[1]

After affirming Ezra to be the initial author, the talmudic writer then continues: "Who then finished it (i.e., the Books of Chronicles)?--Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah."[2] Thus, a two-fold process of authorship is suggested with the implicit assumption that the work was completed under the guidance of one person. In II Maccabees 2:13, Nehemiah is said to be the compiler of what are essentially our present books of Chronicles and Nehemiah.

---

[1] Maurice Simon and Israel Slotki, trans., Baba Bathra, in the Babylonian Talmud, ed. by I. Epstein (26 vols.; London: The Soncino Press, 1935-52), p. 72.

[2] *Ibid.*

> The same things are reported in the records and in the memoirs of Nehemiah, and also that he founded a library and collected the books about the kings and prophets, and the writings of David, and letters of kings about votive offerings.[1]

These traditional views of authorship have their modern-day proponents. In 1921, W. F. Albright suggested that it was not impossible that Ezra was indeed the Chronicler.[2] Admittedly, his identification is more tentative than that of the ancient authorities. Charles C. Torrey would agree with Albright that Ezra and the Chronicler are the same person, but he believes that Ezra is a fictional character devised by the Chronicler for literary and theological purposes.[3] Both Albright and Torrey maintain that the style of the Ezra memoirs (Ezra 7-10; Neh. 8-10) is the dominant style of the Chronicler's work and that therefore the same person composed both. By emphasizing the dissimilarities in style between the Nehemiah memoirs and the rest of the Chronicler's work, Jacob M. Myers affirms that ". . . Ezra appears a more and more likely candidate for authorship."[4] Essentially the same position is affirmed by V. Pavlovsky, but he believes Ezra (alias the Chronicler) wrote I Chronicles through Ezra 6. The portion from Ezra 7 to Nehemiah 13 he believes to be too different stylistically from the first portion to have been written by the same person.[1]

---

[1] It is interesting to note that Ezra is not mentioned. It is equally significant that at this stage (ca. first century B.C.) there is the tacit assumption that one person collected (and presumably edited) a whole block of material.

[2] W. F. Albright, "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler," JBS, XL, (1921), 120. Albright continues to affirm his earlier position regarding Ezra. See The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963), p. 95.

[3] Charles C. Torrey, Ezra Studies (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1910), pp. 238 ff.; and The Chronicler's History of Israel (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), p. xxvii.

[4] Jacob M. Myers, Ezra-Nehemiah (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965), p. lxviii.

Many scholars argue, with equal insistence, that the Chronicler was a person (unknown to us) writing after the period of Ezra and Nehemiah; therefore, the Chronicler could not be identified with either Ezra or Nehemiah.[2] Edward Lewis Curtis maintains that the lists of royalty (I Chr. 3:19-24) and priests and Levites (Neh. 12:1-26) prove conclusively that the Chronicler was writing at a later date than the time of either Ezra or Nehemiah.[3] Both lists (if judged to be authentic) seem to extend to a period well beyond that of Ezra and Nehemiah. For example, Jaddua, the last high-priest mentioned in Nehemiah 12, served during the time of Alexander the Great according to Josephus.[4] (Both Albright and John Bright contend that the high-priest mentioned by Josephus is a second, later Jaddua.)[5] S. R. Driver regards I Chronicles 3:19-24 as an obscure reference which is of little value in proving that the Chronicler wrote after the time of Ezra and Nehemiah; he does accept Josephus' reference to Jaddua as accurate. Driver prefers to emphasize the "internal marks" or style of the books of Ezra-Nehemiah as indicators that the Chronicler compiled his work long after Ezra and Nehemiah.[1] Robert H. Pfeiffer concedes that Ezra may have been an historical person, but if he did exist, his work took place long before the work of the Chronicler. The Ezra stories presuppose that Ezra was active before the Pentateuch was canonized whereas the Chronicler wrote in a time when he had access to the whole Pentateuch.[2] Other scholars not identifiying the Chronicler with either Ezra or Nehemiah include Otto Eissfeldt and Martin Noth.[3]

---

[1] V. Pavlovsky, "Die Chronologie der Tätigkeit Esdras Versuch Einer Neuen Lösung," Bibl, XXXVIII, (1957), 450-51.

[2] An alternative to this order is suggested by Freedman, "Chronicler's Purpose," pp. 440-41. He believes the Chronicler wrote I-II Chronicles before the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. However, the end result is the same since the Chronicler could not be either Ezra or Nehemiah in this proposal.

[3] Edward Lewis Curtis, and Albert Alonzo Madsen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), p. 6. Curtis is cited as the principal author in subsequent references since the major bulk of the work was produced by him. Madsen prepared several sections under the direction of Curtis.

[4] Josephus Antiquities XI, vii, 8. Not all authorities accept Josephus' chronology. See George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim, Vol. I (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), p. 24.

[5] Albright, Biblical Period, p. 95; and John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 302.

Still another possibility for the identification of the Chronicler is proposed by Arvid S. Kapelrud. The Chronicler was not a single writer; rather, "Chronicler" is a composite term for a circle of writers or even groups of circles of writers--all of whom had been influenced by the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah. They all tended to have the same viewpoint about the meaning of Israel's history.[4] To date, few scholars have followed Kapelrud, although many would admit that there were later revisions of the work of the original Chronicler. By implication, this admission allows for the possibility that subsequent "disciples" of the Chronicler updated the master's work, but it does not compromise the belief in one writer.

---

[1] S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (rev. ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923), pp. 518, 540, 544-45. Driver lists these "internal marks" of the Chronicler's style on p. 545.

[2] Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (2nd ed. rev.; New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1948), pp. 256, 811 ff., 831.

[3] Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965), pp. 540 ff.; and Martin Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1957), pp. 153-55; The History of Israel, rev. trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd (2nd ed.; New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1960), p. 356.

[4] Arvid S. Kapelrud, The Question of Authorship in the Ezra Narrative (Oslo: Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1944), pp. 97 ff.

A few scholars have suggested that there was a "Second Chronicler" who completed the work of the original Chronicler by making substantial additions. Adam C. Welch was an early proponent of this view. He claimed that the Chronicler wrote I Chronicles 10:1-II Chronicles 36:21. The first nine chapters of I Chronicles, as well as Ezra-Nehemiah, were added by a later hand. The original Chronicler, ways Welch, wrote in the early post-exilic period (before Ezra or Nehemiah); indeed, his dependence on the D Code (rather than the P Code) demonstrates that he belonged to that community which had never been in exile.[1] More recently, Freedman has reiterated much the same position. He is more specific than Welch--placing the work of the original Chronicler at 515 B.C. Sometime during the fifth century B.C. the "Second Chronicler" added the geneologies of I Chronicles 1-9 and the Ezra-Nehemiah narratives to the original work.[2]

The preceding analysis demonstrates the current state of confusion regarding the identity of the Chronicler. As might be anticipated, there is no less disagreement about when the Chronicler wrote. There is, however, a definite correlation between conclusions about the identity of the Chronicler and the date selected for his work. Proposed dates for the Chronicler's work range from 515 B.C. down to as late as 250 B.C. Welch and Freedman, by virtue of their affirmations about a "Second Chronicler," feel obliged to date the work of the original Chronicler in the sixth century B.C.[1] For some scholars the problem of dating the mission of Ezra becomes crucial to the dating of the Chronicler's work.[2] For example, Albright, affirming that Ezra was the Chronicler, dates the Chronicler's work late in the fifth century B.C.[3] In order to support this date, he has to assume that Ezra came to Jerusalem in 428 B.C. toward the end of Nehemiah's governorship.[4] He also assumes that the P Code was completed in the seventh century B.C.; therefore, Ezra brought with him the completed Pentateuch.[5] Other scholars, while not affirming that Ezra was the Chronicler, nevertheless are obliged to make some decision about the date of Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem before they suggest a date for the Chronicler. The later one dates the mission of Ezra, the later one must date the Chronicler's work. Eissfeldt and Galling, for example, contend that Ezra arrived in 398 B.C.; their dates for the Chronicler are 350 B.C. (Eissfeldt) and 300 B.C. (Galling).[1] Torrey, untroubled by the necessity for dating Ezra's mission (since he claims there never was an Ezra), still dates the Chronicler at ca. 250 B.C. For Torrey, a major factor to be considered is the rivalry between the Jerusalem cult (represented by the Chronicler) and the schismatic Samaritan cult. The Chronicler wrote to silence Samaritan claims that they were the true Israelite community.[2] Pfeiffer concurs with Torrey's date because of the appearance in the Chronicler's work of such "late developments" as the organization of priests and Levites, the animosity against the Samaritans, and the use of the midrashic form of scriptural interpretation.[3] Noth agrees with Torrey's assessment of the major reason for the Chronicler's work, but assigns an earlier date to the crisis of the Samaritan schism.[4]

---

[1] Adam C. Welch, The Work of the Chronicler: Its Purpose and Its Date (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 157.

[2] Freedman, "Chronicler's Purpose," pp. 440-41. See also Kurt Galling, Die Bücher der Chronist, Ezra, Nehemiah (Gottingen: Bandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), pp. 14-17. Galling believes a "Second Chronicler" made substantial additions to the work of the original Chronicler during the Hellenistic period. He assigns to the original Chronicler a date of ca. 300 B.C.

---

[1] Welch, Work of the Chronicler, p. 157; and Freedman, "Chronicler's Purpose," p. 441.

[2] This would apply only to those scholars who date Ezra after Nehemiah. Those dating Ezra before Nehemiah (which few contemporary scholars do) need only to date the Chronicler sometime after Nehemiah.

[3] Albright, Biblical Period, p. 93. Bright, History, p. 385, concurs with Albright.

[4] This date depends on an emendation of the text in Ezra 7:7 so that Ezra arrives in the thirty-seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes I (428 B.C.) instead of the seventh year of the same ruler (458 B.C.). Noth, History, p. 320, favors the 428 B.C. date, but he rejects Ezra 7:7-9 as a post-chronistic addition.

[5] Albright, "Date and Personality of Chronicler," p. 124. Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 811-12, objects vigorously that Albright violates the cardinal tenets of Wellhausian literary criticism by assuming that the Pentateuch was completed before 400 B.C. J. Morgenstern, "The Dates of Ezra and Nehemiah," JSS, VII, (1962), 10, claims that the P Code was compiled after the time of Ezra (whose mission he dates in 458 B.C.).

It is obvious that there is real disagreement as to the identity of the Chronicler and the date of his work. Some scholars (e.g., Freedman, Pfeiffer, Welch) rely rather heavily on literary considerations to aid in their decision; others (e.g., Albright, Noth, Torrey) are more apt to stress historical considerations as they try to arrive at answers to these two problems. Yet, the tentative nature of any answers must be stressed. The problem is compounded by the meager Jewish sources available for the period from ca. 500 B.C. to 330 B.C. (the very period in which the Chronicler did his work).

---

[1] Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 554; and Galling, Die Bücher der Chronist, Ezra, Nehemiah, pp. 13-14.

[2] Torrey, Chronicler's History, p. xxv.

[3] Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 810-12.

[4] Noth, History, p. 355, places the schism right at the end of the Persian period soon after the Gerazim temple was built. (Josephus Antiquities XI, vii, 4, claimed the temple was built during the reign of Darius III ca. 335-330 B.C.). Cross, "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times," HThR, LIX, (1966), 210, argues that the "definitive breach" between the Jews and Samaritans did not occur until the Hasmonean era. He contends that the theology of the Jews and Samaritans in the time of Ezra was very similar.

> For two centuries Israel, together with the whole of the Near East, lived under Persian rule. Apart from what we learn from the material handed down about the reform of public worship in Jerusalem resulting from Cyrus's decree, and about Nehemiah's governorship in the province of Judah in the third quarter of the 5th century, and finally about Ezra's mission in the period immediately after Nehemiah, we know almost nothing about the history of Israel in this long period.[1]

Indeed, the Chronicler is the main source for this period. This makes it exceedingly difficult to give proof for a particular date or a particular author on the basis of historical evidence alone. For example, a casual reading of the Chronicler's work soon discloses a real concern on his part to justify the Jerusalem cult against the claims of the Samaritans. There is no definite proof as to the date of the Samaritan schism. Consequently, when trying to ascertain the date of the Chronicler by this method, one is immediately faced with a *quid pro quo*. Nor is one on safer ground when trying to prove identity or date by means of literary analysis. There is no way of knowing whether Ezra brought the entire Pentateuch to Jerusalem or not. Further, any analysis of the law Ezra did bring would not really help to ascertain a date for the

---

[1] Noth, *History*, p. 337.

Chronicler.[1] It is also somewhat arbitrary to make judgments based on alleged internal stylistic differences (Driver, Freedman, Welch, *et al.*) or on an amended text (Albright, Bright).

The above problems notwithstanding, what can be affirmed with a degree of veracity? A *terminus a quo* and a *terminus ad quem* can be suggested. Apart from the claims of Freedman and Welch (whose position has been repudiated by most scholars), the *terminus a quo* for the Chronicler must be after the missions of Ezra and Nehemiah--i.e., sometime during the late fifth or early fourth centuries B.C., depending upon when the mission of Ezra is dated.[2] The *terminus ad quem* has to be no later than the writing of Ben Sira ca. 180 B.C.[3] Within these limits, a fourth century B.C. date seems plausible. This allows for a possible later dating of Ezra's mission; it allows for the Pentateuch to be compiled before the Chronicler; it allows for a time gap between the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah and the writing of the Chronicler--he seems unable to distinguish clearly between their reforms; finally, it takes cognizance of the fact that the Chronicler's work represents the views that prevailed in a major segment of the Jewish community for a period of about two centuries after the return from exile.

---

[1] It has been assumed by most scholars that the Chronicler wrote sometime after the Pentateuch was compiled. See Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 538-39, for a discussion of the Chronicler's use of the Pentateuch.

[2] Most scholars have been attracted to three possible dates for the mission of Ezra--458 B.C., 428 B.C., or 398 B.C. Each date has its merits and its drawbacks, but, on the whole, the middle date seems the most plausible. See Bright, *History*, pp. 375-86, for a critique of each date and a defense of the 428 B.C. date.

[3] Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, p. 811, calls attention to the dependence of Ecclesiasticus 47:8-10 on I Chronicles 23-29.

The identity of the Chronicler must remain forever a secret. Despite the witness of ancient tradition, it is highly probable that neither Ezra nor Nehemiah was the Chronicler. First, a date in the fourth century for the Chronicler precludes either one as author. Second, it seems rather unlikely that either would have bothered to include the other's memoirs in his own literary work. Despite the arguments of Albright, *et al*., it has been demonstrated rather convincingly that the Chronicler's composition was the work of one individual who combined many sources (including the memoirs of both Ezra and Nehemiah) in his literary endeavor.[1] At this point it is essential to ascertain just what the sources of the Chronicler were.

Sources Used

Determining the sources of the Chronicler is no less complicated and controversial than determining the identity of the Chronicler or the date of his composition. The use of sources in Ezra-Nehemiah, especially, is difficult to ascertain. What is to follow must, therefore, be classified as "most probable." Given this limitation, two questions need to be raised: (1) what sources were available and how did the Chronicler use them? and (2) how accurate historically is the Chronicler's work?

There is some unanimity among scholars as to what sources were available to the Chronicler for the pre-exilic portion of his work (i.e., for the books of Chronicles). In general, I-II Chronicles seem to be based on the Bible from Genesis through Kings. But this general agreement vanishes at the point of specificity; this is especially true of "sources" named in the narrative itself. In I Chronicles 9:1, it is stated that the geneologies (I Chr. 1-9) were taken from the "Book of the Kings of Israel." Probably this should read "Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah" since elsewhere in his work the Chronicler used this title (II Chr. 27:7; 35:27; 36:8).[1] At other points the Chronicler makes reference to the "Words of the Kings of Israel" (II Chr. 33:18) and to the "Midrash of the book of the Kings" (II Chr. 24:27). Eissfeldt believes all the above-mentioned titles refer to one work, "Midrash of the Kings," a later edition of the books of Samuel and Kings from which the Chronicler derived a major portion of his information for the pre-exilic period.[2] Myers rejects the idea of a "midrashic source" for the geneological lists. "It is more than likely that he (the Chronicler) took most of his early lists (I Chr. 1-9) directly from the already compiled Pentateuch, with additions here and there."[3] Adrien Brunet believes the geneological section is a compendium inspired by Genesis, Numbers, and Joshua.[4] Welch believes chapters 1-9 were not part of the Chronicler's original work; they were later additions.[5] Other scholars maintain these named "sources" were fabricated by the

---

[1] The classic proof of this is found in Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, pp. 155 ff.

---

[1] The order is reversed to read "Judah and Israel" in II Chronicles 16:11; 25:26; 28:26; 32:32.

[2] Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 533-34.

[3] Myers, I Chronicles (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965), p. xlvii.

[4] Adrien Brunet, "Le Chroniste et ses sources," RB, LX, (1953), 482.

[5] Welch, Work of the Chronicler, pp. 1 ff.

Chronicler in literary imitation of the various sources named in the Deuteronomist's work.[1]

Other types of sources mentioned by the Chronicler include records of prophets or seers (I Chr. 29:29; II Chr. 9:29; 12:15; 20:34; 32:32) and miscellaneous documents attributed to officials (II Chr. 29:30; 32:10-15, 17). Noth has shown that all the prophets mentioned by the Chronicler also appear in the books of Samuel and Kings; he, therefore, contends that the Chronicler copied his narrative from the relevant sections of the Deuteronomist's composition.[2] Eissfeldt believes the quotations from Isaiah 7:9 and Zechariah 4:10 in II Chronicles 20:20 and 6:9, respectively, demonstrate the Chronicler's use of the prophetic books. There is no reason to assume that the Chronicler was limited to only portions of Samuel and Kings for his "prophetic sources."[3] It is possible, of course, that both the Deuteronomist and the Chronicler had access to the same prophetic materials as the basis for their narratives.

There is wide-spread agreement that the Chronicler depended on an unnamed source--the books of Samuel and Kings--for his formulation of the non-geneological portion of Chronicles (i.e., I Chr. 10-II Chr. 36). This judgment is based on the obvious parallels between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles.[4] At one time it was believed the Chronicler and the writers of Samuel-Kings used common sources; thus, the parallels were drawn independently from these common sources.[1] Most commentators now agree, though, that the Chronicler was dependent on Samuel-Kings or a midrash of these books rather than on a mutually common source. Curtis has maintained that the sources for Chronicles were the canonical books and a "Midrashic History of Israel" based on these canonical books. The Chronicler's use of the midrash accounts for some of the differences between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings regarding the same basic stories. Other differences are attributed to the Chronicler's own purposes in writing.[2] As previously mentioned, Eissfeldt affirms the midrashic history to be the primary source for Chronicles. He further believes that this midrash contained those details which Chronicles has in excess of the canonical Samuel-Kings narratives. Consequently, much of what would appear to be the Chronicler's own creation must, in fact, have been part of the midrash used by him.[3] Recently, Werner E. Lemke has supported this approach by demonstrating that there is no way to prove that the present text of Samuel-Kings is the same as the text available to the Chronicler; therefore, it is too arbitrary to credit the Chronicler with all sorts of theological motivations where his account differs from the present Samuel-Kings.[4] Wilhelm Rudolph has suggested that the Chronicler used the present text of Samuel-Kings for his history of David and Solomon, but a "new edition" of Kings was available to him for the history of the divided kingdom. Rudolph also maintains that the Chronicler made substantial alterations in his source whenever it suited his purpose.[1] There are also scholars who affirm that the Chronicler used the present text of Samuel-Kings without any subsequent "midrash" or "new edition." Any differences between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings are due to the Chronicler's own purposes in writing. Thus, Noth argues that the main source for Chronicles was the books of Samuel and Kings as handed down in the Deuteronomist's historical work.[2] (The latter's presentation of Samuel and Kings was, by the time of the Chronicler, almost identical to the present text.) Von Rad concurs with Noth and emphasizes the arbitrary nature of the Chronicler's use of the deuteronomic source.[3]

---

[1] See Galling, Die Bücher der Chronist, Ezra, Nehemiah, pp. 10-11; and Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, pp. 132-33.

[2] Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 134. Note especially footnote three on "Iddo."

[3] Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 533-34.

[4] A list of parallel passages is given in Driver, Introduction, pp. 519-25.

---

[1] A typical presentation of this view is found in C. F. Keil, The Books of the Chronicles, trans. by Andrew Harper (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872), pp. 28-38.

[2] Curtis, Commentary, p. 24.

[3] Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 534.

[4] Werner E. Lemke, "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History," HThR, LVIII, (1965), 362.

The Chronicler's use of his source is highly selective. Most glaring is the omission in Chronicles of the history of Northern Israel. The whole focus of the Chronicler's history is on Judah--particularly the role of the Davidic dynasty in Judah. Everything taking place before David is omitted or minimized. The life of Saul is chronicled in one brief chapter (I Chr. 10); no credit is given him for his leadership against the enemies of Israel (cf. I Sam. 9 ff). Only through David, and his descendants, does the will of God become revealed for all Israel.

---

[1] Wilhelm Rudolph, "Problems of the Books of Chronicles," VT, IV, (1954), 402-3.

[2] Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 133. See pp. 3-110 of this work for Noth's assessment of the Deuteronomist's work.

[3] Von Rad, Theology, I, 348.

The geneology is traced from David through Zerubbabel as if Northern Israel did not exist (I Chr. 3). Any references to Northern Israel are terse and uncomplimentary. The Elijah-Elisha cycles (I Kings 17-II Kings 13) are eliminated. Even Ahab, so prominent in the Deuteronomist's history (I Kings 17-22), is reduced to one chapter (II Chr. 18) which is an almost exact copy of I Kings 22. The only difference is that the Chronicler has Ahab show great honor to Jehoshaphat (who had, per the Chronicler, "great riches and honor") by providing a sumptuous feast (II Chr. 18:1-2). It is also interesting that occasionally a weakness of a Davidic king--so honestly portrayed in Kings--is eliminated from the Chronicler's account (cf. I Kings 15:14; II Chr. 14:2). Conspicuously absent in Chronicles is the account of the devious means used by Solomon to succeed to the throne (I Kings 1-2).

The additions to the deuteronomic source by the Chronicler are as important as the omissions from it. Torrey has estimated that one-half of the Chronicler's work is his own special material.[1] Most would be inclined to lower this figure somewhat, but the fact of numerous additions by the Chronicler is not debated. Often, these additions alter the older source. Thus, David plays a more active role in preparing for the construction of the temple; Solomon has only to build it (cf. I Kings 5-7; I Chr. 28-II Chr. 5). The story of Uzziah's leprosy is embellished (cf. II Kings 15:5; II Chr. 26:16-21).

An emphasis on cultus has long been recognized as a major feature of the Chronicler's special material in Chronicles. The terse account of Josiah's passover (II Kings 23:21-23) is expanded into a cultic celebration where priests and Levites play the dominant role (II Chr. 35:1-19). The captains and guards who are to protect Joash from Athaliah (II Kings 11) are replaced by priests and Levites (II Chr. 22:10-23:21) because, in the words of Jehoiada, "Let no one enter the house of the Lord except the priests and ministering Levites; they may enter, for they are holy . . ." (II Chr. 23:6). The Chronicler has a special affinity for the Levites. Careful attention is given to their genealogy as well as to a description of their specific duties (I Chr. 6:1-48; 15:16-21; 26; 27). Even some of the levitical cult songs are included in his composition (I Chr. 16:8-36). The Levites assume a special dignity and honor, even greater than the priests (II Chr. 29:5-36). This emphasis on the Levites clearly reflects the Chronicler's own concerns. Nowhere in the deuteronomic historical work or even in the Pentateuch is there any precedent for this particular emphasis. This emphasis has led von Rad and others to affirm that the Chronicler was a member of "levitical circles."[1]

---

[1] Torrey, Ezra Studies, pp. 227-31.

The prominence of David in the cult is a new phenomenon. He legitimates cultic experience, even making "speeches" about the importance of the Jerusalem temple (I Chr. 22:7-16; 28:2-10; 29:1-5).[2] As already mentioned, David prepares fervently all the plans and materials for the

---

[1] See von Rad, Theology, I, 351-52; and Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 539.

[2] These speeches (interpolated in the narrative) are clearly in the levitical preaching style. See von Rad, "The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles," in The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, trans. by E. W. Trueman Dicken (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), pp. 275-76. (The article was written in 1934.)

Jerusalem temple. He even structures the hierarchy of servants in the temple (I Chr. 23-26). The Chronicler would have most of David's time devoted to cultic affairs. What a difference from the picture of David as portrayed by the Deuteronomist. In Samuel and Kings, David is much too involved with winning and defending an empire to be spending his time immersed in ecclesiastical bureaucracy.

The Chronicler's use of the Pentateuch is more difficult to assess than his use of Samuel and Kings. Once the geneological lists (I Chr. 1-9) are noted, it becomes a matter of conjecture as to what extent the Chronicler was influenced by the Pentateuch as he composed Chronicles. At one time scholars were inclined to view the Priestly Code alone as determinative for the Chronicler's work. Typical of this position is Pfeiffer who sees David's concern for proper worship (I Chr. 13-16; 22-29) as an example of the Chronicler's conformity to the Priestly Code (combined with the sacred institutions of his own day). Predictably, Pfeiffer claims the purpose of the Chronicler was ". . . to show how the theocracy founded by Moses according to the Priestly Code continued without a break from David to Nehemiah."[1] There has been a tendency to react against the position represented by Pfeiffer. For example, von Rad emphasizes the affinity of the Chronicler for the ark tradition which is typical of deuteronomic circles; the Priestly Code, by contrast, emphasizes a theology of the tent (tabernacle) (cf. I Chr. 15:14-15; II Chr. 5:2; Exod. 25:8 ff.). "It is typical that the Chronicler countered the priestly writer's Aaronite tradition of the tabernacle with a forthright theology of the ark associated with the Levites."[1] By emphasizing the ark tradition, the Chronicler is able to show concern for its bearers--the Levites. But, von Rad is quite aware that the Chronicler has gone beyond the Deuteronomist to write the theology of this particular group. From the standpoint of the Deuteronomist, the function of the Levites ended once David brought the ark to Jerusalem (II Sam. 6), but the Chronicler uses this occasion for David to set up new offices (the service of song) for the former ark bearers (I Chr. 6:16). From the vantage point of the Priestly writer, the primary emphasis was on the sons of Aaron who officiated first before the tabernacle and later in the temple.[2] Von Rad is willing to concede very little to the Chronicler's use of the Priestly Code. Other scholars seek a mediating position between von Rad and Pfeiffer by emphasizing the Chronicler's use of the entire Pentateuch (P as well as D) in composing Chronicles. Artur Weiser gives credence to von Rad's emphasis on Deuteronomy, but points out that the Chronicler also used the P Code as his standard--e.g., the Passover celebrations in II Chronicles 30:13-27; 35:1-19.[3] Eissfeldt believes the Chronicler's view of cultus is determined by the entire Pentateuch (which he believes to be dominated by the Priestly writing). Thus, the sacrifices of David and Solomon at unauthorized sites (II Sam. 24:25 and I Kings 3:4-15) are altered to conform to priestly standards (I Chr. 21:26-22:1 and II Chr. 1:3, respectively). Eissfeldt continues by affirming that the significant measures affecting the Levites have no basis in the Pentateuch at all; they reflect the concerns of the Chronicler's own environment. Rather than appeal to Moses for authority (as did the Priestly writer), the Chronicler makes David (the traditional singer of psalms) the one who legitimizes the levitical office.[1] Scholars who affirm a "Second Chronicler" believe he used the Pentateuch for a source, although this would not hold true for the "First Chronicler." (Proponents of the two Chronicler theory say the geneological lists in I Chr. 1-9 were not composed by the original Chronicler.)

---

[1] Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 802.

---

[1] Von Rad, "The Tent and the Ark," in Problem of the Hexateuch, p. 103. (The article was written in 1931.)

[2] Von Rad, Theology, I, 351-52.

[3] Artur Weiser, The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development, trans. by Dorothea M. Barton (New York: Association Press, 1961), p. 325.

Arguments that the Chronicler made use of the Priestly Code legislation in formulating his own theology are convincing. Equally meritorious is von Rad's view. The best solution seems to be that which allows for the Chronicler to have used the sources of the past while yet going beyond them in his own formulation. Certainly the Chronicler was indebted to priestly theology; the Levites were very much a part of priestly tradition. But, in pressing the Levites' case, he had to go beyond the priestly view of the Levites (cf. Exod. 6:16-24; I Chr. 6:16 ff.). Finally, the Chronicler's yoking of the law of Moses with the cultic institutions of David represented a union totally new to the literature of Israel. It affirmed the bid of a particular group for greater prominence within the priestly hierarchy. (It is also possible that the emphasis on David had messianic overtones.)[2]

---

[1] Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 538-39.

[2] See Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 537-38; and S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, trans. by G. W. Anderson (New York: Abingdon Press, 1955), pp. 159 ff.

Scholars generally agree that the Chronicler used the Deuteronomist's historical work and some portion of the Pentateuch as his sources for Chronicles.[1] There is not complete agreement as to the authenticity of the sources quoted by the Chronicler. The available evidence does not allow for a definitive answer. In the words of one commentator:

> It remains an open question whether the Chronicler's inaccuracies in quoting his sources should make us regard his statements simply as an imitation of the quotations in the book of Kings, giving us no special historical information from the literary point of view about what was available for his use, or whether further conclusions might be drawn from them concerning his literary sources.[2]

It is possible that the Chronicler used sources which, because they are unspecified in I and II Chronicles, must remain unknown for the present. There is the further possibility that differences between Chronicles and Kings are due to the Chronicler's use of a different recension of Kings than that attested in the present MT.[3]

The existence of two large blocks of material (the memoirs of Ezra and the memoirs of Nehemiah) would seem to solve the problem of sources for a sizeable portion of the canonical books of Ezra and Nehemiah. However, there is wide-spread disagreement about the existence of the Ezra memoirs as a source. Noth claims that the Chronicler himself wrote the Ezra memoirs (Ezra 7-10; Neh. 8-10) as an imitation of the memoirs of Nehemiah.[1] Torrey concurs and even goes so far as to say: "The entire picture of the Return from the Babylonian exile is absurd and impossible throughout, unworthy of any serious attention."[2] In fact, says Torrey, the Chronicler made up about two-thirds of the entire Ezra-Nehemiah narrative--especially the various lists of names.[3] Albright, by affirming Ezra to be the Chronicler, actually agrees with Noth, but Albright's identification of the Chronicler does not help clarify the role of the Ezra memoirs as a source.[4] Kapelrud, by contrast, admits that the Ezra narrative appears to be the work of "Chronicler circles," but only because these groups were the final editors. In fact, it had its origin long before the rise of these "Chronicler circles." "It will never be possible to find out to whom the Ezra tradition 'originally' is to be traced."[5] Eissfeldt says the first person form found in Ezra 7:11-9:5 is sufficient proof that this portion of the Chronicler's work was derived from the memoirs of Ezra. He is not so certain about the origin of the prayer (9:6-15). Nehemiah 8-10 is attributed to the Chronicler's rewriting of unknown sources.[6]

---

[1] Cf. Albright, Biblical Period, p. 95; Brunet, "Chroniste," p. 482; Curtis, Commentary, pp. 17-18; Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 531-32; Myers, I Chronicles, pp. xlix-liii; and Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 132.

[2] Weiser, Old Testament, p. 326.

[3] It is well-known, e.g., that the LXX version of Samuel and the version of Samuel found near Qumran (4QSam) are both based on a different recension of Samuel than that upon which the MT is based. See Cross, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," BASOR, #132 (December, 1953), 15-26; "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," JBL, LXXIV, (1955), 165-72; and Harry M. Orlinsky, "Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: The Septuagint Text," JBL, LXXVIII, (1959), 31-32. It is therefore probable that the Chronicler had access to several recensions of Kings.

---

[1] Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, pp. 146-48.

[2] Torrey, Chronicler's History, p. xxvii.

[3] Torrey, Ezra Studies, pp. 238-39.

[4] Albright, Biblical Period, pp. 95, 113 (footnote 197).

[5] Kapelrud, Question of Authorship, pp. 94-97. (The quotation is from p. 94.)

[6] Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 542-44.

Mowinckel goes so far as to claim that the "I" and "He" references in Ezra 7-10 represent the somewhat confused reporting of an actual witness to the events described.[1] Weiser, too, believes the Ezra memoirs to be authentic.[2] Those scholars affirming the memoirs to be authentic agree that the Chronicler dismembered his source to fit his own purposes. On the whole, it seems likely that the memoirs of Ezra are an authentic source which has been embellished by the Chronicler and subsequent editors.

The memoirs of Nehemiah are less controversial than those of Ezra as a source. There is general agreement that the "memoirs" comprise Nehemiah 1-7; 13, but there are variations within this agreement.[3] Loring W. Batten limits the extent of the "memoirs" to 1:1-4; 1:11b-2:7; 2:9b-20; 3:33-7:5a; and 13:6-31.[4] Torrey regards Nehemiah 1-6 as based on a genuine source although Nehemiah 7 (the geneological lists) and 12 (the enactment of the law) were composed by the Chronicler without using a genuine source.[5] Other scholars disagree with Torrey's assessment of the geneological lists.[1] Galling says Nehemiah 7 // Ezra 2--both lists are essentially the same--is an authentic list of the contemporary "religious community" drawn up ca. 519 B.C.[2] Some scholars include 11:1-2 and 12:27-43 with the memoirs.[3] Noth believes 12:27, 31-32, 37-40, 43 to represent the genuine "memoirs" which the Chronicler embellished with the references to the priests and Levites.[4]

---

[1] Mowinckel, "'Ich' und 'Er' in der Ezrageschichte," in Verbannung und Heimkehr: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie Israels im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr., ed. by Arnulf Kuschke (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1961), pp. 214 ff.

[2] Weiser, Old Testament, p. 320.

[3] Cf. Driver, Introduction, pp. 550-51; Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 828-29; and Rudolph, Esra und Nehemiah (Tübingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1949), p. xxiv.

[4] Loring W. Batten, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), pp. 14-15.

[5] Torrey, Ezra Studies, pp. 224-27, 248.

Despite differences concerning the limits of the Nehemiah memoirs, scholars agree that they were a genuine source of the Chronicler. The only question remaining is when the memoirs were added to the Chronicler's composition. Galling believes they had an independent existence until ca. 200 B.C. when the "Second Chronicler" added them to the already existing composition of Chronicles and Ezra,[5] but other scholars assume the memoirs were incorporated by the Chronicler in his original composition.[6]

Other possible sources for the books of Ezra and Nehemiah include: (1) the Aramaic source upon which Ezra 4:6-6:18 is based;[7] (2) the Hebrew source for the writing of Ezra 1:1-4:5; and (3) the various lists incorporated into Nehemiah 11-12. Some scholars question whether the Aramaic portion of Ezra depends on a genuine source. Torrey claims that the Aramaic letters are found ". . . in the most untrustworthy of all Hebrew histories . . ." (i.e., the Chronicler's history); therefore, they can not possibly be genuine.[1] Noth believes the Chronicler composed this section ca. 300 B.C. as a contemporary interpretation of events taking place in the past. The confusion in chronology is due to the great time elapsed between the events and the interpretation of those events by the Chronicler.[2] Generally, though, scholars agree that Ezra 4:6-6:18 is based on an authentic source available to the Chronicler.[3] Admittedly, this portion of Ezra is chronologically inaccurate as it stands in the present text. Events taking place in the reign of Darius I (522-486 B.C.), as reported in 4:24-6:18, are placed after those which occurred in the later reigns of Xerxes (486-465 B.C.) and Artaxerxes I (465-424 B.C.), as reported in 4:6-23. Probably this is best explained by Rudolph's suggestion that the Chronicler transposed these sections so that 4:6-16 would document the hostility of the Samaritans as reported in 4:1-5.[4]

---

[1] See Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 551; and Weiser, Old Testament, p. 322.

[2] Galling, "The 'Gola-List' According to Ezra 2 // Nehemiah 7," JBL, LXX, (1951), 149-58.

[3] Cf. Driver, Introduction, pp. 550-51; Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 544-46; Myers, Ezra-Nehemiah, p. xlix; and Weiser, Old Testament, p. 321.

[4] Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 150.

[5] Galling, Bücher der Chronist, p. 10.

[6] Cf. Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 544; and Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 834 ff.

[7] The text of Ezra 4:8-6:18 is in Aramaic. Ezra 4:6-7 serves as an introduction (in Hebrew) to the Aramaic portion which follows.

There is less certainty concerning the possibility of a source behind Ezra 1:1-4:5. Eissfeldt says this entire section is "probably" derived from a source although he concedes that it could be the Chronicler's own work.[1] Noth and Rudolph believe the Chronicler based this section on the authentic fragments of sources in Ezra (1:2-4, 8-11a; 2) and his knowledge of the books of Haggai and Zechariah.[2] Weiser says the evidence is too ambiguous to choose between the positions of Eissfeldt and Noth-Rudolph.[3] Torrey predictably classifies this section of Ezra as the invention of the Chronicler.[4]

---

[1] Torrey, Ezra Studies, pp. 156-57.

[2] Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, pp. 151-54.

[3] Cf. Driver, Introduction, pp. 547-48; Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 543; Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 829; and Weiser, Old Testament, pp. 319-20.

[4] Rudolph, Esra und Nehemiah, pp. 34-35.

The lists in Nehemiah 11-12 are enigmatic. No one knows for sure what their sources were. Eissfeldt testifies to the impenetrable mystery. He believes Nehemiah 11:3-19 is parallel to I Chronicles 9:2-18; both must go back to the same original (undesignated) source. The list in Nehemiah 11:20-36 was perhaps composed by the Chronicler although a pre-exilic origin is not impossible. Nehemiah 12:1-26 depends in part on reliable sources (perhaps a Temple chronicle), but the present form stems from the Chronicler or possibly a later editor. As for 12:27-43, it is the sequel of 11:1-2 which may be a list of those settled in Jerusalem by Nehemiah, but this can not be proved.[5] Weiser is no less ambivalent. He finds 12:27-43 to be taken from Nehemiah's memoirs. Nehemiah 11:3-19, 20-36 are "later insertions," although he rejects the notion that all the lists are later fabrications.[1] Driver agrees with Weiser about 12:27-43. The lists in chapter eleven he believes to date from the time of Nehemiah, although not necessarily from the memoirs. Nehemiah 12:1-26 is derived from "other, older sources" (unspecified).[2] Torrey regards Nehemiah 11-12 as the Chronicler's own invention.[3] Overall, with the exception of Torrey, the general consensus is one of respect for the authenticity of the lists coupled with a great deal of uncertainty about their origin.

---

[1] Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 543.

[2] Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, pp. 144-45; and Rudolph, Esra und Nehemiah, p. xxiii.

[3] Weiser, Old Testament, p. 319.

[4] Torrey, Ezra Studies, pp. 238-39.

[5] Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 550.

Biblical historians agree that the period after the rebuilding of the temple (ca. 515 B.C.) until the end of the Persian Empire (331 B.C.) is one of the most unknown periods in the history of Israel.[4] With the exception of Malachi,[5] religious and political conditions in Palestine are described only in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The question of the Chronicler's historical accuracy is crucial because: (1) the events described by him were purported to take place during this period; and

---

[1] Weiser, Old Testament, pp. 321-22.

[2] Driver, Introduction, p. 551.

[3] Torrey, Ezra Studies, pp. 248-50.

[4] Albright, Biblical Period, p. 90; Bright, History, p. 356; and Noth, History, p. 337.

[5] Malachi was written ca. 450 B.C. The Elephantine Papyri were also written during this period. The papyri are useful in discerning the mode of life among certain diaspora Jews, but their value as a source for conditions in Palestine is limited primarily to a corroboration of some of the names listed in Ezra and Nehemiah. For a complete translation of these papyri see A. H. Sayce and A. E. Cowley, eds., Aramaic Papyri Discovered at Assuan (London: Alexander Moring, 1906); Eduard Sachau, Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus einer jüdischen Militär-Kolonie zu Elephantine (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911); and Emil G. Kraeling, ed., The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri: New Documents of the Fifth Century B.C. from the Jewish Colony at Elephantine (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953).

(2) his work, based on these events, was completed during this period. Scholars place Ezra-Nehemiah especially under the scrutiny of historical criticism.

Those who are inclined to be skeptical about the Chronicler's historical worth cite his "misuse" of the Deuteronomist's history and his chronological confusion in Ezra-Nehemiah (placing Ezra before Nehemiah[1] and misplacing Ezra 4:6-23) as proof that his use of sources (either real or alleged) can not be trusted. Thus, Torrey claims the Chronicler's main value is for edification only; the Chronicler's picture of the return from exile is completely false.[2] Noth believes the Chronicler "restructured" history so as to legitimate the claims of the few who actually did return from exile.[3] Others believe the Chronicler has some historical value (especially in the memoirs of Nehemiah section), but chronological inaccuracies preclude accepting the Chronicler as a "full-scale" historian.[4]

Some scholars dismiss the chronological inaccuracies of the Chronicler or his alleged "misuse" of the Deuteronomist as insignificant. Driver believes Ezra 4:6-23 was inserted by the Chronicler accidently; the Chronicler then ". . . referred by error to troubles connected with the restoration of the Temple what related in fact to the restoration of the city walls."[1] Eissfeldt admits that the Chronicler distorted his sources for the earlier period (i.e., Chronicles), but this in no way reflects on his work pertaining to his own period (i.e., Ezra-Nehemiah). In Chronicles, the Chronicler was trying to justify current practices by referring back to David. As for Ezra 4:6 ff., the Chronicler deemed the order of subject matter more important than correct chronological order. So, attempts to hinder the Jews were reported together, regardless of whether the reference was to the Temple or to the city walls.[2] Weiser is inclined to agree with Eissfeldt. He admits that Chronicles is not the equal of Samuel and Kings as an historical work, although much of value can be gleaned from Chronicles. As for Ezra and Nehemiah, they are ". . . a valuable historical source for our knowledge of the formation of the post-exilic Jewish religious community."[3] H. Neil Richardson goes even further to say that the Chronicler can no longer be seen as "less historical" than the Deuteronomist. In several passages in Chronicles (for which there are no parallels in Kings) the Chronicler's own account accords very nicely with archaeological evidence. In fact, the regnal chronology in Chronicles may be more accurate at certain points than that in Kings.[4]

---

[1] This criticism, of course, is given only by those who date Ezra after Nehemiah. See Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 818 ff., for a typical presentation of this criticism.

[2] Torrey, Chronicler's History, pp. ix, xxvii.

[3] Noth, History, pp. 296, 308.

[4] Cf. Batten, Commentary, p. 47; Curtis, Commentary, p. 14; and Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 806, 820-30.

There is general disagreement over the question of historical accuracy of the Chronicler just as there is over the question of what

---

[1] Driver, Introduction, p. 548.

[2] Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 539-40, 551.

[3] Weiser, Old Testament, pp. 322-23, 328.

[4] H. Neil Richardson, "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles," JBR, XXVI (1958), 9-12. The passages cited are: II Chronicles 15:19-16:6; 17:12; 26; and 35:20.

sources he used. Neither question can be answered in any definitive sense. Probably a legitimate treatment of the Chronicler demands that the questions of sources and historical accuracy be placed in the larger context of what the Chronicler's purpose was. The Chronicler speaks for a broad segment of Judaism in a particular historical period. He is reflecting the claim of Judeans that they are the true heirs to the promises made to the fathers; he also seeks to solidify the position of a particular group--the Levites. Some scholars have emphasized that the Chronicler was writing a midrash, or interpretation of history, and the place of the chosen people within that history.[1] The dominant concern of the Chronicler was theological, not historical. In the process he may have oversimplified his presentation of events.[2] The Chronicler's work has value, in and of itself, quite apart from any question of its "historical veracity." It must be admitted that the Chronicler used his sources freely; it is not always possible (especially in Ezra-Nehemiah) to delineate these sources. But, despite these shortcomings, the Chronicler is still our major source for the total life of the post-exilic religious community as well as for certain aspects of the pre-exilic period.

Having analyzed the Chronicler's work as a separate entity up to this point, it is now essential to examine this work as it relates to the rest of the Old Testament canon.

---

[1] Both Welch, Work of the Chronicler, p. 54, and von Rad, Theology, I, 347, emphasize the midrashic quality of the Chronicler's work. Welch, of course, is only dealing with the portion from I Chronicles 10:1-II Chronicles 36:21 since he believes the first nine chapters of I Chronicles were added by a later hand.

[2] The same appraisal must be given for the Deuteronomist's work. He, too, had a theological purpose which guided his presentation of history. See von Rad, Theology, I, 334-47.

Relationship to the Old Testament Canon

It has already been stated that the Chronicler's work represents the beliefs and practices of the post-exilic Judean community for a period of several centuries after the exile. It is now the task to examine what position the Chronicler's work occupied in Judaism during the late post-exilic period--i.e., during the first two centuries B.C. and the first century A.D. Although this represents a period when sectarian interpretations of Judaism flourished in Palestine, it is also a period when there was a gradual emergence of what may be called a "normative expression" of Judaism.[1] Concomitant with this development in Judaism--though not linked exclusively to it--was the emergence of a canon of sacred scripture which was common to all segments of Palestinian Judaism.[2] Determining the relationship of the Chronicler's work to the Hebrew canon thus determines the relationship of that work to the broad stream of Palestinian Judaism during the late post-exilic period.

Generally, many scholars have accepted (with individual modifications) the traditional literary critical dates for the canonical process--i.e., the Pentateuch ca. 400 B.C., the Prophets ca. 200 B.C., and the Writings during the first century A.D.[3] However, there is a growing realization among scholars that the process of canonicity was considerably more fluid than hitherto thought. The above dates may represent general "cutting off" points, but there were additions to the "canonical" literature after these dates as late as the end of the first century A.D. The rabbis at Jamnia are generally regarded as the group responsible for the fixing of the Hebrew canon, but the ordering of "sacred scriptures" and "non-sacred scriptures" which had evolved for several centuries prior to ca. A.D. 100 extended even beyond Jamnia.[1] Canonicity, then, is best seen as an on-going process by which certain writings (over a period of time) come to have special significance for the religious community. Eventually, a delineated canon of scriptures is affirmed by the religious community. The task now is to try to decide what position Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah occupy vis-a-vis the rest of the Hebrew canon.

---

[1] A full discussion of "sectarian" and "normative" Judaism is given on pp.

[2] This is known as the Hebrew canon; it is composed of Hebrew and Aramaic writings which circulated throughout Palestine for several centuries and were eventually "recognized" by rabbinical authorities as the official scriptures of Judaism. This is not to be confused with the Alexandrian (Hellenistic Jewish) canon which included Greek translations of the Hebrew canon plus other literature not found in the Hebrew canon.

[3] A defense of these traditional dates is given in Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 56-65.

It is obvious that the books of Ezra and Nehemiah were originally attached to the end of Chronicles. The historical continuity of the narrative demands that Chronicles come first. The similarity of the last verses of II Chronicles 36 and the first verses of Ezra 1 also suggests a different order from the present one in the Hebrew canon. The most common assumption among scholars is that Chronicles, as a "midrash" of Samuel-Kings, was not fully accepted as inspired scripture initially whereas Ezra-Nehemiah was accepted very quickly because it narrated events not reported in other "canonical" literature.[2] It is not known when Chronicles was added to the

---

[1] See Jack P. Lewis, "What Do We Mean by Jabneh?" JBR, XXXII (1964), 125-32; and Albert C. Sundberg, Jr., The Old Testament of the Early Church (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), pp. 113-28, for excellent recent treatments of the process of canonicity.

[2] Cf. Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 64; Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 567; and Weiser, Old Testament, p. 318.

Hebrew canon, but this occurred sometime before the first century B.C.[1] Ezra-Nehemiah retained its position following Samuel-Kings even though this order preserved an historical discontinuity.[2]

It has been suggested that Chronicles was not popular immediately and was added to the Hebrew canon sometime after Ezra-Nehemiah. Some scholars are even inclined to believe that the entire work of the Chronicler remains, at best, only at "the edge of the canon." For example, Rudolph contends that the Chronicler is not in the main stream of Old Testament theology.

> For what fundamentally differentiates the attitude of the Chronicler towards the rule of God from the main line of Old Testament thought (that of the prophets) is the almost complete disappearance of eschatological expectation.[3]

By contrast, Eissfeldt emphasizes that the decision allowing the "period of inspiration" to extend from Moses to Artaxerxes I shows that the work of the Chronicler was held in some repute by the rabbinical authorities.[4] It is also quite likely that the legal and cultic emphasis of the Chronicler soon gave his work a special significance as the "salvation-history" of the congregation of the second temple (even in the late post-exilic period).[1] Even the so-called "midrashic" quality of Chronicles must have been downplayed.[2] Many commentators have emphasized the role popularity of particular literature among the common people played in the canonizing process. This seems to have been especially true with respect to what was included in the third section of the Hebrew canon.[3] The relatively early canonization of the Chronicler's work may well have reflected this kind of pressure from the common people. Certainly the inclusion of the Chronicler's work in the Hebrew canon indicates its acceptance as "sacred scripture." There is no evidence to indicate any question was raised at Jamnia about the canonical value of Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles. The earliest lists of canonical books always include the Chronicler's work.[4] Therefore, his work must have had quasi-canonical status by the first century B.C.

---

[1] II Maccabees 2:13 (written during the first century B.C.) refers to what is basically the Chronicler's entire work although Ezra is not mentioned: "The same things are reported in the records and in the memoirs of Nehemiah, and also that he founded a library and collected the books about the kings and prophets, and the writings of David, and letters of kings about votive offerings."

[2] Scholars are unable to determine why this historical discontinuity was permitted. Perhaps this was due to the influence of the traditional order (i.e., Ezra-Nehemiah after Kings) or perhaps it was just part of the "mentality of Jamnia." For fuller discussion, see Peter Katz, "The Old Testament Canon in Palestine and Alexandria," ZNW, XLVII (1956), 193.

[3] Rudolph, "Problems of Chronicles," p. 408. The same position is held by Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), p. 36.

[4] Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 568.

The canonical status of the Chronicler's work was secure as a part of the "Writings," but within the canon itself, there were degrees of relative merit. The "Law" and the "Prophets" were generally accepted as having more intrinsic value than the third section of the Hebrew canon.[5]

---

[1] See Weiser, Old Testament, p. 339.

[2] However, it is interesting to note that one rabbi termed Chronicles "midrash" (rather than "sacred scripture") as late as A.D. 50. See Lewis, "What Do We Mean by Jabneh?" p. 129.

[3] Cf. Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 62; and Sundberg, Old Testament, pp. 125-26.

[4] Contrast this with the continuing disputed canonical status of Esther, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs. See Sundberg, Old Testament, p. 168.

[5] One proof of this is the earlier canonization of the first two sections of the Hebrew canon. For further discussion, see Vriezen, Outline of Theology, pp. 5, 42.

One can only surmise why the Chronicler's composition was placed in the third section of the Hebrew canon. (It is interesting to note that the Septuagint contains the entire work of the Chronicler in the "historical books" section.) Surely this position indicates that there is a measure of truth when one places the Chronicler's work at "the edge of the canon." Perhaps its strong levitical-priestly bias was somewhat offensive to Pharisaic rabbis; perhaps there was still some hesitancy concerning its historical value; perhaps, as Rudolph suggests, it was judged to be somewhat unfaithful to the prophetic heritage. However, Katz is right; the rationale behind many decisions at Jamnia can not be ascertained.[1]

In the final analysis, the Chronicler's work, even though it may be considered to be on the edge of the canon, is still a canonical work, and, as such, it is part of the literature which a broad spectrum of Judaism (including the various sectarian groups) appropriated as its own sacred scripture.

The Dead Sea Scrolls

In 1947, the scholarly world was astounded by the discovery of a cache of scrolls (written in Hebrew and Aramaic) in the vicinity of Khirbet Qumran near the north-western corner of the Dead Sea. The details of this discovery are too well-known to necessitate reiteration at this point.[2] After the necessary cataloging of the texts, it was discovered that the cache included biblical (i.e., Old Testament) manuscripts, fragments of apocryphal and pseudepigraphical works, paraphrases of biblical works, commentaries on biblical works, and sectarian literature--i.e., works which have no direct relationship to canonical or extra-canonical literature. Included in this last category are books of discipline, hymns, and various liturgical writings.[1] The finding of the scrolls presented several major problems to scholars--problems which still elicit divergent and controversial responses. The initial problems have been to determine when the scrolls were written and to whom they may be attributed. In addition, scholars soon noticed that the literature from Qumran had striking affinities with the Zadokite Document. This presented another problem: Was there any relationship between the group producing the Dead Sea Scrolls and the group producing the Zadokite Document? Scholars have been faced with a final problem: What is the relationship of the group composing the literature of Qumran to the rest of Judaism.

---

[1] Katz, "Old Testament Canon," p. 193.

[2] Excellent summaries of the discoveries are available in Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: Viking Press, 1956), pp. 3-69; More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 20-36; and Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 3-47.

Date of the Scrolls

Most scholars have accepted limits of approximately 175 B.C. to A.D. 68 for the writing of the Qumran scrolls. This general consensus is based primarily on the evidence of archaeological and paleographical findings. As a result of excavations at Khirbet Qumran, an accurate stratigraphy was established based on datable coins and pottery. This, in turn, has been useful in dating the scrolls. The same group occupied the site from the time of John Hyrcanus (ca. 135 B.C.) to A.D. 68, but this occupation was broken by a period of abandonment dating from 31 B.C. (the time of the great earthquake in Judah) until early in the reign of

---

[1] As noted on page 7, only the biblical commentaries and the sectarian literature will be analyzed in this dissertation.

Archelaus (ca. 4 B.C.). The excavators labeled the occupation levels prior to 31 B.C. Periods Ia and Ib;[1] The occupation level dating from 4 B.C. to A.D. 68 was labeled Period II. It is assumed (justifiably in this writer's opinion) that the same group returned to Khirbet Qumran in 4 B.C. since there are no major differences between the plan of the buildings found in Periods Ib and II.[2] Numismatic evidence corresponds to this stratigraphy very well.[3] There is no distinction in the coins found in Periods Ia and Ib. The earliest coins date from the reign of John Hyrcanus (135-104 B.C.). The latest coins in these two periods date from the reign of Herod the Great (37-4 B.C.), but only five coins are dated in his long reign. This relative scarcity of coins compared with, e.g., 86 coins from the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.) seems to indicate that there was not much activity at Khirbet Qumran during the reign of Herod the Great.[4] The earliest coins found in the Period II stratum date from the reign of Archelaus (4 B.C.-A.D. 6). The latest coins date from A.D. 68-69--the very time when it is likely that Khirbet Qumran was destroyed by the Romans on their way to conquer Jerusalem.[1]

---

[1] The major difference between Ia and Ib is that the buildings in the former were found to be less complex and smaller than those in the latter. In addition, the water system in Ia was much less extensive than that in Ib. Evidently a large number of immigrants to the desert settlement were the cause of the extensive building program which distinguishes Ib from Ia. For the full report of the excavation, see R. de Vaux, "Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire sur les 3^e, 4^e, and 5^e campagnes," RB, LXIII (1956), 533-77.

[2] See de Vaux, "Fouilles," pp. 545-47, for a complete report. See also Cross, Ancient Library, p. 61; and Milik, Ten Years of Discovery, p. 54.

[3] Analysis of the evidence of coins is drawn from de Vaux, "Fouilles," pp. 565-68.

[4] This is the argument of Cross, Ancient Library, p. 60.

Most of the pottery was found in Periods Ib and II.[2] The lamps, in particular, are very helpful in distinguishing between periods of occupation. Hellenistic lamps--of a type already familiar in Palestinian ceramic chronology--are typical in Ib, but only Herodian lamps (again, familiar types) are found in Period II. These finds fit very well into the chronology suggested by the numismatic evidence.

Having established the chronolpgy of occupation at Khirbet Qumran on the basis of pottery and coins, archaeologists were then able to determine when the scrolls found in Caves I and IV were placed there.[3] In both caves, archaeologists found pottery (especially lamps) identical to that found in the strata Ib and II at Khirbet Qumran. Fragments of these lamps were found in sealed loci with various fragments of manuscripts.[4] In addition, the jars in which some scrolls were found are typical of first century A.D. Roman ware.[5] Carbon 14 tests on the linen wrappings of some of the scrolls yielded a date of A.D. 33, with a plus or minus margin of

---

[1] Iron arrowheads--typical of Roman armies--were found in the debris of the main fortification. See Cross, Ancient Library, p. 61.

[2] See de Vaux, "Fouilles," pp. 551, 562-63, for a description of the pottery finds.

[3] Manuscripts from these two caves have provided the major bulk of the Qumran literature found to date.

[4] This evaluation has been made by de Vaux, L'archéologie et les manuscrits de la mer Morte (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 40, based on his work as reported in "La Grotte des manuscrits hébreux," RB, LVI (1949), 586-609 (pertaining to Cave I manuscripts); and "Fouille au Khirbet Qumrân," RB, LX (1953), 83-106 (pertaining to Cave IV manuscripts).

[5] See James L. Kelso, "The Archeology of Qumran," JBL, LXXIV (1955), 141-42, where W. F. Albright's opinion (as related to Kelso in private communication) about the age of the jars is given.

200 years.[1] From the standpoint of archaeological evidence, then, there is no question that the scrolls were written and placed in the caves sometime prior to the destruction of Khirbet Qumran in A.D. 68. However, archaeologists are able to provide with a degree of certainty only the terminus ad quem for the writing of the scrolls. It has been the task of paleographers to determine more precisely when the scrolls were written prior to this established terminus ad quem of A.D. 68.

A pivotal point in the development of the science of paleography was Albright's analysis of the Nash Papyrus in 1937.[2] As a result of this analysis, the main lines of the evolution of Hebrew scripts from ca. the fifth century B.C. to the first century A.D. were fixed prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Paleographers are in agreement that the writing in the manuscripts from Qumran can be fitted into this chronology of writing forms rather precisely.[3] The analysis of Cross is typical of the findings of paleographers. He suggests that the writing of the scrolls fits into three periods (not to be confused with archaeological periods at Khirbet Qumran): (1) Archaic, ca. 200-150 B.C.; (2) Hasmonean, ca. 150-30 B.C.; and (3) Herodian, ca. 30 B.C.-A.D. 70. Most of the manuscripts were written during the latter parts of periods two and three--the times when activity at Qumran was most pronounced. Although some of the biblical manuscripts are dated in the Archaic period, Cross concludes that ". . . the earliest sectarian MSS fell into Period 2."[1] The relative dating within these periods is rather precise because of the swift evolution of scripts within the two centuries covered by these three periods.[2] Further proof of the validity of this classification is suggested by the script in the Bar Kokhba letters. These letters (discovered at Wadi Murrabbaat) are dated in the period of the second Jewish Revolt (ca. A.D. 132-35).[3] The script of these letters is demonstrably different from that found in the Qumran scrolls written in the Herodian period.[4] Thus, the Bar Kokhba letters represent a script which can best be labeled "post-Herodian"--a script which is typical of the period A.D. 70-135.[5] These letters thus provide still more proof for the terminus ad quem of the Qumran literature. Admittedly, since paleographers are working with extant scrolls only, it is possible that original versions of some of the Qumran scrolls were written earlier, but, on the whole, the science of paleography still offers to scholars the most objective method of dating the scrolls within rather general chronological periods.

---

[1] For a description of the test, see O. R. Sellers, "Radiocarbon Dating of Cloth from the 'Ain Feshkha Cave," BASOR, #123 (October, 1951), 24-26.

[2] Albright, "A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabaean Age: the Nash Papyrus," JBL, LVI (1937), 145-76.

[3] Cf. Albright, "On the Date of the Scrolls from 'Ain Feshkha and the Nash Papyrus," BASOR, #115 (October, 1949), 10-19; N. Avigad, "The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents," in Scripta Hierosolymitana, Vol. IV: Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls, ed. by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin (Jerusalem: Magnes Press for the Hebrew University, 1958); Solomon A. Birnbaum, "The Dates of the Cave Scrolls," BASOR, #115 (October, 1949), 20-22; "The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography," BASOR, #13-14, supplementary studies (1952); and Cross, "Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," pp. 147-72.

---

[1] Cross, "Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," p. 164.

[2] Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 118-19. Extensive proof of this evolution of the script is offered by Cross in his article "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," in The Bible and the Ancient Near East, ed. by G. Ernest Wright (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961).

[3] Some of the letters actually contain the date when they were written. See Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, II, 159-63, for the publication of these letters and for the reports of the excavations at Wadi Murrabbaat.

[4] See the analysis by Cross, "La lettre de Simon Ben Kosba," RB, LXIII (1956), 45-48.

[5] Cross, "Development of the Jewish Scripts," pp. 173-74.

Some scholars have attempted to date the writing of the scrolls on evidence other than that presented by archaeologists and paleographers. G. R. Driver and Cecil Roth believe the Qumran buildings were occupied by Jewish forces until A.D. 73. The original group at Qumran left in 31 B.C. In A.D. 6, a new group (totally unrelated to the original inhabitants) moved in--staying until A.D. 73. It was this group, rather than the original inhabitants, which produced the Dead Sea Scrolls.[1] There is some variation between Driver and Roth in dating the scrolls. Driver dates the various scrolls from A.D. 46 to as late as A.D. 132.[2] Roth is inclined to believe that the Jewish Revolt of A.D. 66-73 forms the background for most of the Qumran literature.[3] Apart from the problems inherent in positing two different groups at Qumran (for which there is no evidence), the Driver-Roth position is weakened because it ignores the archaeological evidence for the destruction of Qumran as well as the evidence for dating the scrolls found in Caves I and IV. In addition, these scholars ignore the evidence of paleographical analysis.

At the other end of the chronological spectrum from Driver-Roth, Isaac Rabinowitz has argued that all the scrolls were composed in the Maccabean era between 175 B.C. and 152 B.C. He bases this judgment on internal evidence (a description in the scrolls of religious and political conditions) which he links chronologically with passages from Daniel and the books of Maccabees.[1] No reference is made to either the archaeological data or the findings of paleographical research. Consequently, his presentation is rather one-sided. Rowley, too, believes all the scrolls were composed during the second century B.C. He traces the historical situation very carefully and finds that the conditions described in the scrolls (especially the rivalry between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest) best fit the Maccabean period. He does believe that the same sect continued to live at Khirbet Qumran until the destruction of A.D. 68.[2] However, Rowley tends to dismiss paleographical evidence. He contends that the scrolls discovered in the Qumran caves could be later copies of earlier compositions.[3] It is possible that this is the case, but there is no way to prove this contention. Paleographers are dealing with extant texts which were written over an extended period of time. Until further evidence is produced to the contrary, there is no justification for assuming that all the scrolls were written in the second century B.C. Possible allusions to historical figures do not offer a firm base upon which to make such a judgment.

---

[1] See G. R. Driver, The Judean Scrolls (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), pp. 359-73; and Cecil Roth, "The Jewish Revolt against the Romans (66-73) in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," PEQ, XC (1958), 104-21.

[2] Driver, Judean Scrolls, p. 373.

[3] Roth, "The Zealots in the War of 66-73," JSS, IV (1959), 332-55.

One scholar has refused to date the scrolls anywhere in the period from the second century B.C. to the first century A.D. Solomon Zeitlin, in language often strident and bellicose, has characterized the scrolls as "medieval compositions," totally unrelated to the time period suggested by the archaeological and paleographical data. He rejects archaeological data because he claims the scrolls were not discovered by professional archaeologists in situ.[1] (This argument is totally erroneous. See above.) He also claims that paleographers have overlooked orthographic evidence--such as the matres lectionis and final letters in Hebrew--which he claims were not present in Hebrew texts until the time of Rabbi Akiba (ca. A.D. 110).[2] Although Zeitlin continues to defend his position with vigor, few are inclined to follow his lead.[3]

---

[1] Isaac Rabinowitz, "Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls and 'Damascus' Fragments," VT, III (1953), 175-85.

[2] See Rowley, "Some Traces of the History of the Qumran Sect," ThZ, XIII (1957), 531.

[3] Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956), pp. 62 ff.

In summary, this writer regards the archaeological and paleographical evidence as proof that the Qumran documents were written at various points in the period extending from the Maccabees to A.D. 68. There is no justification for limiting all the literature to either the Maccabean period or the Roman period.

Relationship to the Essenes

Despite some variation between scholars in dating the scrolls (as noted above), there is wide-spread agreement that the Qumran scrolls were composed under the aegis of one particular group or sect within Judaism.

---

[1] Solomon Zeitlin, The Dead Sea Scrolls and Modern Scholarship (Philadelphia: Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1956), pp. 87-88.

[2] Ibid., pp. 81-82. Others argue that the fullest use of matres lectionis was achieved in the Maccabean era. See Cross and Freedman, Early Hebrew Orthography (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952), p. 69.

[3] See Zeitlin, "The Fallacy of the Antiquity of the Hebrew Scrolls Once More Exposed," JQR, LII (1961-62), 346-66; "History, Historians and the Dead Sea Scrolls," JQR, LV (1964-65), 97-116. (Nearly all of Zeitlin's articles are found in the JQR of which he is the co-editor.) Only one scholar has consistently followed Zeitlin. See E. R. Lacheman, "Can Hebrew Paleography Be Called 'Scientific'?" JQR, XLII (1951-52), 377-85; and "Hebrew Paleography Again," JQR, XLIV (1953-54), 116-22.

Discounting the testimony of Zeitlin (whose view is now universally rejected), scholars have searched for the authors of the scrolls among various sect groups within Judaism during the first two centuries B.C. and the first century A.D. Candidates for authorship include the Hasidim,[1] the Zealots,[2] the Pharisees,[3] the Sadducees,[4] the Ebionites,[5] the Essenes,[6] or even a new sect group hitherto unknown.[7] Of these possibilities, the Zealots, a new sect group, or the Essenes have had the strongest proponents. The proponents of these possible identifications have depended rather heavily on their own interpretations of the accounts of the Essenes as given by ancient historians. Among these ancient historians are Josephus, Philo, and Pliny.[1]

---

[1] L. Rabinowitz, "The First Essenes," *JSS*, IV (1959), 358-61.

[2] Cf. H. E. Del Medico, *Deux manuscrits hebreux de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1951), pp. 63-64; *L'énigme des manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Libraire Plon, 1957), p. 94; Driver, *Judean Scrolls*, pp. 237-51; and Roth, "Zealots," pp. 336-37.

[3] Leah Bronner, *Sects and Separatism during the Second Jewish Commonwealth* (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1967), pp. 118-49; and Chaim Rabin, *Qumran Studies* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957), pp. 53-70.

[4] Robert North rather "half-heartedly" suggested a Sadducean origin. See North, "The Qumran 'Sadducees,'" *CBQ*, XVII (1955), 164-88.

[5] J. L. Teicher, "The Dead Sea Scrolls--Documents of the Jewish-Christian Sect of Ebionites," *JSS*, II (1951), 67-99.

[6] Most scholars now affirm this identification--e.g., Cross, *Ancient Library*, pp. 51-52 ff.; A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, trans. by G. Vermès (New York: World Publishing Company, 1961), pp. 39-42; and Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, pp. 44 ff.

[7] Scholars affirming this position (although disagreeing on many specifics) include: John M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Penguin Books, 1956), pp. 94-100; H. Schonfield, *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., Ltd., 1956), pp. 134-41; and B. Otzen, "Die neugefundenen Hebräischen Sektenschriften und die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen," *STh*, VII (1953), 125-57.

Josephus describes the Essenes in both the Antiquities of the Jews and the War of the Jews.

> The Essenes have a reputation for cultivating peculiar sanctity . . . . Marriage they disdain, but they adopt other men's children, while yet pliable and docile, and regard them as their kin and mould them in accordance with their own principles. . . . They occupy no one city, but settle in large numbers in every town. On arrival of any of the sect from elsewhere, all the resources of the community are put at their disposal, just as if they were their own; and they enter the houses of men whom they have never seen before as though they were their most intimate friends. . . . There is yet another order of Essenes, which, while at one with the rest in its mode of life, customs, and regulations, differs from them in its views on marriage. They think that those who decline to marry cut off the chief function of life, the propagation of the race, and, what is more, that, were all to adopt the same view, the whole race would very quickly die out. They give their wives, however, a three years' probation, and only marry them after they have by three periods of purification given proof of fecundity (Josephus War II, viii, 2-13).

> The doctrine of the Essenes is this: That all things are best ascribed to God. They teach the immortality of souls, and esteem that the rewards of righteousness are to be earnestly striven for: and when they send what they have dedicated to God into the temple, they do not offer sacrifices, because they have more pure lustrations of their own; on which account they are excluded from the common court of the temple, but offer their sacrifices themselves; yet is their course of life better than that of other men; and they entirely addict themselves to husbandry (Josephus Antiquities XVIII, i, 5).

Philo writes about the Essenes in two of his works--Every Good Man is Free and Apology for the Jews.[2]

> Palestinian Syria, too, has not failed to produce high moral excellence. In this country live a considerable part of the very populous nation of the Jews, including as it is said, certain persons, more

---

[1] The testimony of Hippolytus is obviously dependent on the account written by Josephus; therefore, Hippolytus is not of value to scholars as an independent source for the Essenes. His work will be discussed in a subsequent section.

[2] References to Philo are found in T. E. Page et al., gen. eds., Philo, Vol. IX, trans. and ed. by F. H. Colson (10 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929-41).

> than four thousand in number, called Essenes. Their name which is, I think, a variation, though the form of the Greek is inexact, of "holiness," is given them, because they have shown themselves especially devout in the service of God, not by offering sacrifices of animals, but by resolving to sanctify their minds. The first thing about these people is that they live in villages and avoid the cities because of the iniquities which have become inveterate among city dwellers, for they know that their company would have deadly effect upon their own souls, like a disease brought by a pestilential atmosphere. . . . As for darts, javelins, daggers, or the helmet, breastplate or shield, you could not find a single manufacturer of them, nor, in general, any person making weapons or engines or plying any industry concerned with war. . . (Philo Every Good Man is Free XII, 75-78).

> Multitudes of his disciples has the lawgiver trained for the life of fellowship. These people are called Essenes, a name awarded to them doubtless in recognition of their holiness. They live in many cities of Judaea and in many villages and grouped in great societies of many members. . . . Furthermore they eschew marriage because they clearly discern it to be the sole or the principal danger to the maintenance of the communal life, as well as because they particularly practice continence. For no Essene takes a wife, because a wife is a selfish creature, excessively jealous and an adept at beguiling the morals of her husband and seducing him by her continued impostures (Philo Apology for the Jews XI, 1, 14).

Pliny mentions the Essenes once in his Natural History.[1]

> On the west side of the Dead Sea, but out of range of the noxious exhalations of the coast, is the solitary tribe of the Essenes, which is remarkable beyond all the other tribes in the whole world, as it has no women and has renounced all sexual desire, has no money, and has only palm-trees for company. Day by day the throng of refugees is recruited to an equal number of numerous accessions of persons tired of life and driven thither by the waves of fortune to adopt their manners. Thus through thousands of ages (incredible to relate) a race in which no one is born lives on for ever: so prolific for their advantage is other men's weariness of life!
>
> Lying below the Essenes was formerly the town of Engedi, second only to Jerusalem in the fertility of its land and in its groves of palm-trees, but now like Jerusalem a heap of ashes. Next comes Masada, a fortress on a rock, itself also not far from the Dead Sea. This is the limit of Judaea (Pliny Natural History V, xv, 73).

G. R. Driver and Roth have argued that the Zealots produced the

---

[1] The reference to Pliny is found in T. E. Page et al., gen eds., Pliny: Natural History, Vol. II, trans. and ed. by H. Rackham (10 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1944-47).

Qumran literature. They base their judgment on Pliny's statement that the monastic center of the Essenes was still flourishing several years after the destruction of Jerusalem. Therefore, the Essenes could not have been at Qumran when it was destroyed. (Both scholars believe Qumran was destroyed in A.D. 73.) Further, the Essenes were a pacifistic sect which would not have aroused the ire of the Romans.[1] Who, then, was present at Qumran? Roth maintains that the War Scroll (1QM) found at Qumran demonstrates that a war-like group (the Zealots) occupied Qumran in its final years prior to destruction.[2] Although Driver dates the War Scroll after the destruction of Qumran, he believes that Qumran served as an outpost for the Zealots stationed at Masada.[3] Both scholars identify the Teacher of Righteousness (so prominent in the Habbakuk Commentary) as either Menahem or Eleazar ben Jair; the Wicked Priest was Eleazar ben Hananiah (the Captain of the Temple) who hunted down and killed Menahem.[4] By these identifications, Driver and Roth seek to validate their assertion that all the scrolls were written in the first century A.D. Del Medico also identifies the Zealots as the authors of the Qumran literature, but his theory has some individual intricacies which distinguish it from that of Driver and Roth. Menahem (a leader of one faction of the Zealots) was the Teacher of Righteousness; the Wicked Priest was the high priest Ananias.[1]

---

[1] This is based on an interpretation of Pliny's statement as well as the description of the Essenes by Philo. See Driver, Judean Scrolls, pp. 116-18; and Roth, The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), pp. 81-82.

[2] Roth, "Were the Qumran Sectaries Essenes? A Re-examination of Some Evidences," JThS, X (1959), 89-91.

[3] Driver, Judean Scrolls, pp. 396-99. See Cross, Ancient Library, p. 75, for an excellent refutation of this view.

[4] Roth, "Jewish Revolt," pp. 111-12; and Driver, Judean Scrolls, pp. 267-81.

The "Zealot theory" of composition depends on two a priori assumptions: (1) historical allusions in the Dead Sea Scrolls best fit the time of the First Jewish Revolt; the Zealots, not the Essenes, were involved in the political intrigues of this period; (2) archaeological and paleographical evidence, which is considered as secondary to historical references in the ancient literature, is often misleading. The results of the Carbon 14 test on the scroll coverings and the absence of coins at Qumran for the period right after A.D. 68 are said to be too inconclusive to date either the writing of the scrolls or the destruction of Qumran. As for paleography, it is said to be too subjective. "The paleographical argument then in all its forms is at the best inconclusive, at the worst inapplicable."[2] The chief weakness in the "Zealot theory" is its strong reliance on what is at best only a tenuous link between actual historical figures and cryptic allusions to historical figures in the scrolls. Milik (who believes the Essenes wrote the scrolls) points out regarding the Teacher of Righteousness: "Neither this title nor the name of the founder of the Essenes are found in the writings of Greek and Latin historiographers, and it is hopeless for us to try to identify him with a known figure."[3] In addition, the Zealot theorists seem a bit cavalier in their treatment of the evidence of various modern scientific disciplines.

The basic premise of those affirming the existence of a new sect at

---

[1] Del Medico, Deux manuscrits, pp. 132-37.

[2] Driver, Judean Scrolls, p. 416.

[3] Milik, Ten Years of Discovery, p. 74.

Qumran is that none of the sects described by the ancient historians is enough like the Qumran sect to merit a complete identification with that sect. Neither are the historical allusions in the scrolls sufficiently clear to merit identification with any particular group. Archaeological and paleographical research is helpful in establishing the history of the Qumran sect and its literature, but this in no way allows the scholar to identify this sect with an already-known sect within Judaism. Allegro refers to the Qumran community as the "Sectarians" or the "Qumran Sect," but he avoids identifying them with any known Jewish sect. He does accept the evidence of archaeology for a destruction date of A.D. 68. To explain this destruction, he suggests that possibly the "Sectarians" left as the Romans approached and that the Zealots from Masada then moved in to defend this strategic position at the head of the Dead Sea.[1] Schonfield calls the Dead Sea Scroll group the "New Covenant Party" and claims that the "New Covenant Party" associated with the Essenes. But, these two parties were not the same; the "New Covenant Party" moved to Qumran at the end of the first century B.C. after the Essenes moved out and stayed there until the destruction. He follows the Driver-Roth theory in dating the destruction of Qumran at A.D. 73.[2] The "new sect" theorists are more cautious than other scholars who make a positive identification of the Qumran sect with a known Jewish sect. At one time, when the scrolls were still being translated and published, this position represented by Allegro and Schonfield was reasonable. At this point, with the vast amount of Qumran materials published, and with the results of scientific disciplines now available, it is less justified to "sit on the fence."

---

[1] J. M. Allegro, Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 82-87.

[2] Schonfield, Secrets of the Scrolls, pp. 134-41.

The most tenable position is that which identifies the Qumran sect with the Essenes. This identification accords best with all of the variable factors to be considered--the witness of the ancient historians and the evidence of the modern scientific disciplines of archaeology and paleography. Some who were at first unwilling to make this identification have modified their views. Typical of this change is Burrows who earlier said, ". . . if by Essene we mean a particular sect, which we assume to be accurately described by the ancient writers, then the covenanters were not Essenes."[1] Later, he wrote: "It is thoroughly possible, even probable, that Pliny's Essenes were the men of Qumran."[2] There are, to be sure, some problems involved in this identification, especially the discrepancies between the practices of the Essenes as described by the ancient authorities and those practices related in the Qumran documents. For example, Pliny's statement that the Essenes lived without women, without money at a settlement on the western shore of the Dead Sea just north of 'Ain Gedi seems to accord very well with evidence from the scrolls and with excavations at Qumran. Philo and Josephus, to the contrary, make no mention of the settlement at the Dead Sea; rather, they describe the Essenes as scattered in towns and villages throughout the land. Philo says the Essenes were a celibate group. Josephus mentions another order of Essenes which marries for the primary purpose of producing progeny. (He does, however, devote most of his description to the non-marrying, non-propertied Essenes.) Female skeletons have been unearthed at Qumran near the ruins of the monastery (separate from the male burials).[1] How are such discrepancies to be reconciled? Bleddyn J. Roberts and John Strugnell simply assume that Josephus was sometimes mistaken and that scholars must now use the Qumran documents to correct his account of the Essenes.[2] Milik, too, prefers to emphasize Pliny's account so as to identify the Qumran group as Essenes.[3] Cross, in speaking to the question of celibacy, states that there were not two orders of Essenes (per Josephus) nor were all Essenes celibate (per Philo); rather, there was an ambiguous attitude toward marriage among the Essenes which is reflected in the Qumran literature (cf. 1QSa 1:4, 9-10; 1QS 4:7). Some married; some did not.[4] Thus, he, too, tends to use the Qumran sources to correct, or more accurately, to amplify the ancient sources. Rowley offers a unique and rather plausible theory designed to harmonize all disparities. Differences between the ancient historians and the scrolls may be due to their having been written at different stages of development within the life of the sect. The scrolls were written at an earlier stage of Essenic history; the practices of the sect had been modified by the time the various historians wrote.[1] It is also quite possible that Qumran served as a monastic retreat center for the entire Essene brotherhood, but that many Essenes lived out their lives dispersed throughout the towns and villages.

---

[1] Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 294.

[2] Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 274.

---

[1] See de Vaux, "Fouilles," pp. 569-72, for an analysis of the findings.

[2] John Strugnell, "Flavius Josephus and the Essenes: Antiquities XVIII, 18-22," JBL, LXXVII (1958), 106-15; and Bleddyn J. Roberts, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Essenes," NTS, III (1956-57), 58.

[3] Milik, Ten Years of Discovery, p. 56.

[4] Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 96-98. Brownlee was the first scholar to refer to the possibility of marrying and non-marrying Essenes. See William H. Brownlee, "A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Pre-Christian Jewish Sects," BA, XIII (1950), 65.

Other apparent discrepancies between the ancient sources and the scrolls include attitudes towards sacrifice and the Temple. At one time it was believed (primarily on the testimony of Philo) that the Essenes rejected sacrifice.[2] Yet the emphasis throughout the scrolls is hardly anti-clerical. The founder of the group was a priest; the communal structure was dominated by priests. Cross suggests that Philo's statement must be read to mean that the Essenes did not reject sacrifice and the official cult per se, but that they believed the present temple order was polluted, and, therefore, the sacrifices offered there were invalid.[3]

Finally, Dupont-Sommer has suggested that some discrepancies between the ancient historians and the scrolls (such as the omission in the former of references to the Teacher of Righteousness, to messianic expectations, and the final cataclysmic battle) are due to the secret, esoteric nature of the Essenes. What is revealed in the scrolls is written from the Essenic point of view whereas the ancient historians, as outsiders, could not have known everything.[1] Nevertheless, there are enough doctrines of the Qumran sect (such as the strong emphasis on communal life, the rites of water purification, and the emphasis on prayer life) affirmed by the ancient writers to justify labeling the Qumran group "Essenes."[2]

---

[1] Rowley, Zadokite Fragments, pp. 82-83. This theory is also espoused by Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 65.

[2] Contrast this with the account of Josephus in which the Essenes are said to offer their own sacrifices although they still continued to send offerings to the Temple.

[3] This is emphasized by both Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 100-1 and Roberts, "Qumran Scrolls," p. 63.

The basic stance of scholars supporting the "Essene theory" is that the ancient sources are valuable and authentic from their limited perspective. Where there are seeming contradictions between them, or between them and the information available from the Dead Sea Scrolls, then it is because none of the ancient historians could present the total picture of the Essenes which is now available in the scrolls.

In addition to the witness of the ancient historians, the archaeological and paleographical evidence also supports the "Essene theory" of authorship. Cross summarizes the evidence very succinctly. The location of Khirbet Qumran fits very well the description given by Pliny. The site itself, with its central community hall and elaborate water system, lends credence to the identification with the Essenes. The common life of the Essenes, with community meals and daily purifications, is well attested throughout the scrolls and Josephus. The paleographical evidence is also convincing. The fact that the scrolls were written over a two hundred year period indicates that the Qumran sect was a major group within Judaism.

---

[1] This line of reasoning could be true of Philo and Pliny. However, it is possible that Josephus spent some time living with the Essenes although there is no proof that he ever became a fully initiated member of that sect. See Josephus Life of Flavius Josephus 2.

[2] Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, pp. 42-61, 67. See Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 94-95, for further evidence of similarities between the Essenes and the Qumran community in terms of organization, rites of lustration, and sanitary regulations.

It is highly unlikely that such a group would remain unmentioned by contemporary historians of that period. The only possible identification of the Qumran sect has to be the Essenes.[1]

There is not complete agreement among scholars espousing the "Essene theory" as to the identity of key figures described in the scrolls. The archaeological data indicates a terminus a quo for occupation at Qumran, but such a date (late second sectury B.C.) has nothing to do with the origin of the sect itself. It is highly probable that the sect began to form before fleeing to the desert; it is even possible that certain of the Dead Sea Scrolls refer to events which took place during this earlier period. Rowley places the Teacher of Righteousness in the period from 175-165 B.C. and proceeds to identify him as Onias with Menelaus as the Wicked Priest.[2] Cross believes the Essene movement began with a struggle between two priestly groups: one was orthodox and Zadokite (the immediate forerunner of the Essenes); the other was less orthodox and Hasmonean (Simon and his followers). With the election of Simon to the high priesthood in 142 B.C., a systematic persecution of the Zadokites took place, and they were forced to flee to the desert. So, the Essenes were then born as a new apocalyptic priestly community.[3] Simon is seen to be the Wicked Priest, but as for the identity of the Righteous Priest, "For all our labors, he remains a shadowy figure. We do not know even his name. There is no hint of his identity in our older sources."[1] Dupont-Sommer concurs with Cross on the anonymity of the Teacher of Righteousness, but he identifies Hyrcanus II as the Wicked Priest; the ministry of the Teacher of Righteousness is, therefore, to be dated from ca. 104-63 B.C.[2] These few examples suffice to show the diversity of views on the early history of the sect among scholars who, nevertheless, agree as to the identity of the sect.

---

[1] This is the line of reasoning developed by Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 72-73.

[2] See Rowley, Zadokite Fragments, p. 67; and "The Qumran Sectaries and the Zealots: An Examination of a Recent Theory," VT, IX (1959), 390-91.

[3] Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 127-41. This view of the Essenes as a dissident priestly group is supported by Milik and Vermes, but they push the date of origin for the sect back to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. See Milik, Ten Years of Discovery, pp. 80-83 ff.; and Géza Vermès, Discovery in the Judean Desert (New York: Desclee Company, 1956), pp. 74-76.

Historical allusions within the scrolls themselves are too vague to justify a definite link with specific historical figures. From the standpoint of strict Jewish orthodoxy, a good number of the high priests in the Hasmonean and Herodian periods could qualify as the Wicked Priest. Generally speaking, this was a time of violence and chaos. The rule of thumb for most of the high priests was to persecute any who posed a real (or imagined) threat to the policies (often of a pro-Hellenistic nature) of the newly installed leader. Probably the suggestion of Simon (per Cross) as the Wicked Priest is as legitimate as any identification made to date. As for the Teacher of Righteousness, he remains a powerful, but shadowy, figure who can not be identified on the basis of the texts presently available.[3]

---

[1] Cross, Ancient Library, p. 156.

[2] Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, pp. 351-59.

[3] This term, while originally referring only to the founder of the sect, may have been applied to the current leader in the later history of the sect. See L. E. Toombs, "The Early History of the Qumran Sect," JSS, I (1956), 370.

Relationship to the Zadokite Document

In 1910, Solomon Schechter published two Hebrew manuscripts which he had found (in 1896) in the genizah of the Ezra synagogue at Cairo. He called these the "Fragments of a Zadokite Work" because of the continual reference to the Sons of Zadok within the literature.[1] Generally, English-speaking authors have followed Schechter's terminology in referring to his find as "Zadokite Fragments" or "Zadokite Document." German-speaking scholars have usually referred to these manuscripts as "*Die Damaskusschrift*" in recognition of the title given within the document itself, i.e., "*Die Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes im Lande Damaskus*" ("The Community of the New Covenant in the Land of Damascus"). The larger of the two fragments, labeled "Text A," comprises eight sheets; it contains the history of a new congregation formed within Judaism 390 years after the exile to the land of Nebuchadrezzar. After twenty years, this group was led by a Teacher of Righteousness (מורה צדק); eventually, the congregation was forced to emigrate to "Damascus." After this historical survey, the latter part of "Text A" contains some of the regulations which governed the congregation while in "Damascus." The community appears to be organized on the basis of priestly leadership. The smaller fragment, "Text B," is only one sheet. Its first half runs parallel to "Text A," but in the second half reference is made to the terrible fate of the "betrayers of the 'New Covenant'" as well as to the glorious future of those who are willing to repent. ("Text A" contains only the beginning of the threat which applies to the betrayers.) Both fragments date from approximately the eleventh century A.D.[1]

---

[1] Solomon Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, Vol. I: *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge: University Press, 1910). See Rabin, ed., *The Zadokite Documents* (2nd ed. rev.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1958); and Zeitlin, *The Zadokite Fragments* (Philadelphia: The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1952), for a translation and facsimile of the manuscripts.

The immediate problem confronting scholars was to identify the sect or group producing these fragments. Since the cache also contained writings of the Karaite sect,[2] some scholars immediately assumed the Zadokite Document was a sectarian work of that sect. Zeitlin continues as the most vociferous proponent of this view.[3] Many more scholars believed the fragments were medieval copies of writings produced by a much earlier Jewish sect. Suggestions for the identification of the sect included the Ebionites,[4] the followers of John the Baptist,[5] the Pharisees,[6] and various other sects which existed in the intertestamental period.[7] One scholar, Israel Levi, argued for an identification with the Essenes, primarily on the basis of organizational affinities, but his was a solitary voice.[1] An acknowledged authority in intertestamental literature, R. H. Charles, gave what was for many the final word. A new priestly "party," previously unknown (which he labeled "Zadokites") produced this literature. Although contemporaries of the Essenes, the Pharisees, and the Sadducees, they were not to be identified with any of these sects.[2] And so the matter rested until the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947.

---

[1] See Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, pp. 114-21, 142-48, for a complete description of these two fragments.

[2] The Karaites were a medieval Jewish sect. They rejected the Talmudic interpretation of the rabbinical authorities in favor of a more direct approach to the scriptures. In many ways, their tenets resembled those of the Sadducees. See Leon Nemoy, Karaite Anthology (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952), for a complete description of Karaite theology.

[3] See Zeitlin, Zadokite Fragments, pp. 5-11. Zeitlin describes the views of several of the earliest proponents of the "Karaite theory" of composition (pp. 4-5).

[4] Teicher, "The Damascus Fragments and the Origin of the Jewish Christian Sect," JJS, II (1951), 115-43.

[5] Julius Schousboe, La secte juive de l'alliance nouvelle au pays de Damas et le Christianisme naissant (Copenhague: E. Munksgaard, 1942), p. 33 ff.

[6] Dahl, Das Volk Gottes, p. 129.

[7] See Rowley, Zadokite Fragments, pp. 79-80, for a list of various other sects suggested.

Scholars soon noticed that the Zadokite Document and the Dead Sea Scrolls had many striking affinities.[3] For example, both refer to a specific covenant on which the community life is based (cf. CD 2:1; 8:11, 15; 1QpHab 2:3; 1Qs 1:8, 16). Common to both is the assertion that the sanctuary at Jerusalem was defiled (cf. CD 20:22-24; 6:11-14; 1QpHab 12:7-9; 8:8-13).[4] In addition to the above, there is also a glossary of terms common to both literatures: Teacher of Righteousness (cf. CD 1:7; 8:10; 9:53; 1QpHab 1:13; 2:2; 5:10; 7:4; 8:3);[5] Sons of Zadok (cf. CD 6:2; 1QS 5:2); Man of Lies (cf. CD 8:1; 9:22; 1QpHab 2:1; 5:11; 10:9); Messiah of Aaron and Israel (cf. CD 7:21a; 12:23; 14:10; 1QS 9:11).

---

[1] Israel Levi, "Un écrit sadducéen antérieur à la destruction du Temple," *REJ*, LXIII (1912), 9-10.

[2] R. H. Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, Vol. II: *Pseudepigrapha* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), p. 790.

[3] See Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, p. 91, for an index of parallel passages in the Zadokite Document and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

[4] Cross deals at length with the question of the defiled Jerusalem sanctuary. He even suggests that the Essenes may have had an independent sacrificial cultus. See *Ancient Library*, pp. 100-3.

[5] See J. Weingreen, "The Title Môrēh Ṣeḏeḳ," *JSS*, VI (1961), 162-74, for a special study on the "Teacher of Righteousness."

There are, to be sure, some minor differences between the Zadokite Document and the Dead Sea Scrolls. It appears that the Manual of Discipline is addressed to the premises of common ownership of property whereas the Zadokite Document presupposes the owning of property (cf. CD 11:12; 12:10; 14:13; 16:16; 1QS 6:3, 17). Such terms as the "Star" appear only in the Zadokite Document (CD 9:8) whereas the term "Kittim," so prominent in the Habakkuk Commentary (1QpHab 2:12, 14; 3:9; 4:5; 6:1; 9:7), never appears in the Zadokite Document.

Because of the numerous similarities between the two literatures (especially between the Manual of Discipline, the Habakkuk Commentary, and the Zadokite Document), most scholars have affirmed that the same sect produced both. This consensus included even Zeitlin. Of course, he believes all three documents were composed during the Middle Ages.[1] For many others, however, the obvious corollary of an affirmation of joint authorship is that the Essenes produced the Zadokite Document as well as the scrolls found at Qumran. This conclusion has been strengthened by the discovery of fragments of a manuscript like the Zadokite Document in various caves at Qumran.[2] From the standpoint of those affirming the validity of archaeological techniques, this find proves the antiquity of the original Zadokite Document. It also suggests (for those who claim the Essenes wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls) that the Essenes used, and in all liklihood produced, the Zadokite Document. Any difference between CD and the remaining scrolls is attributed to different phases in the evolution of the Essenes as a sect within Judaism.[1]

---

[1] Zeitlin, Zadokite Fragments, pp. 5, 28-29.

[2] These fragments have been found in Caves 4, 5, and 6. Basically, they agree with the already known "Text A." See Milik, Ten Years of Discovery, pp. 38-39, 60, for a description of the Qumran fragments.

Even for those affirming Essenic authorship of the original Zadokite Document, two problems needed to be solved. When was the original document written? How is the emigration to "Damascus" (CD 6:5, 19; 7:19; 8:21) to be understood within the context of current knowledge about the Essenes? Some scholars believe the Zadokite Document was written during the Hellenistic Period. Cross, because of the absence of the term "Kittim" in the Zadokite Document, believes the two fragments were composed before the Roman Period in either the late second century B.C. or the early first century B.C.[2] Vermès assumes the Teacher of Righteousness died ca. 140 B.C., and, on the basis of a statement that forty years elapsed between his death and the writing of the document (CD 20:13-15), places the writing at ca. 100 B.C.[3] Rowley believes there was an evolution of Essenic practices best illustrated by comparing the Zadokite Document and the Manual of Discipline. The former was written during the earliest period of the Essenes when there was no monastic life, no common meals and lustrations, no common property--all of which are attested in the Manual of Discipline.[4] Although Rowley suggests no specific date, his dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls necessarily places the Zadokite Document as early as the middle of the second century B.C. Other scholars argue for a composition date during the Roman period. Dupont-Sommer says the title "Chief of the Kings of Yawan" (CD 9:20) refers to Pompey; therefore, the Zadokite Document was written sometime after Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem in 63 B.C. He also affirms that the Manual of Discipline was composed before 63 B.C.[1] Milik dates the oldest Qumran copy of the Zadokite Document at ca. 75-50 B.C. although it does refer to earlier events.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 90; and Rowley, Zadokite Fragments, pp. 82-83.

[2] Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 81-82.

[3] Vermès, Discovery in the Judean Desert, pp. 76-77.

[4] Rowley, "Traces of the Qumran Sect," pp. 537-39. Cross reverses the order; the Manual of Discipline was written before the Zadokite Document. See Ancient Library, p. 83.

The above disparate viewpoints illustrate that the basic problem is still to determine where the historical events recounted in the Zadokite Document fit into the known history of the Essenes. In particular, the emigration to "Damascus" (which is not mentioned in the other scrolls or in any of the ancient accounts of the Essenes) needs to be considered within the framework of Essenic history. Many scholars believe there actually was an emigration to "Damascus," but there is no common agreement as to when this occurred and who participated in it. Rowley believes the whole sect fled to Damascus sometime after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness (ca. 171 B.C.) but before 131 B.C. The assumption is that during this period a Syrian regime hostile to the Jerusalem authorities would welcome and protect any who were fleeing from persecution.[3] Milik maintains that a fairly large splinter group left the Qumran monastery to take up temporary residence in the land of Damascus. This occurred during the reign of John Hyrcanus (135-105 B.C.).[4] In the opinion of Dupont-Sommer, the entire sect fled to Damascus from Qumran ca. 63 B.C. after the Teacher of Righteousness had been killed. This exile lasted until 40 B.C. when the Essenes returned to Qumran.[1] Others rely heavily on the archaeological evidence which shows that the Qumran site was abandonned from the time of the great earthquake (ca. 31 B.C.) until the end of Herod's reign (ca. 4 B.C.). It is assumed that this period is when the Essenes were in exile in Damascus.[2] Other scholars affirm that there never was a literal emigration to Damascus. Rather, this phrase is to be taken as a symbolic or esoteric designation for the exile in the desert at Qumran.[3] On the whole, the arguments against an actual emigration to Damascus are most convincing to this writer. The suggestion of North seems most valid. He contends that the phrase "land of Damascus" refers to an area in the Nabataean kingdom, which included the area around Khirbet Qumran.[4]

---

[1] Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, pp. 119-20.

[2] Milik, Ten Years of Discovery, pp. 58-59, 88-90. Milik claims the "Kings of Yawan" are unknown Seleucid kings (pp. 72-73).

[3] Rowley, Zadokite Fragments, pp. 74-75.

[4] Milik, Ten Years of Discovery, p. 90.

There is general agreement that the Essenes produced both the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Zadokite Document. There is no unanimity about the date of composition of the Zadokite Document. The present evidence is sparse enough to allow ambiguity on this point. Nevertheless, it is quite appropriate (indeed necessary) to include the Zadokite Document as part of the Essenic materials to be analyzed.

---

[1] Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 119.

[2] Cf. C. T. Fritsch, "Herod the Great and the Qumran Community," JBL, LXXIV (1955), 173-81; and de Vaux, L'archéologie et les manuscrits, pp. 18-19, 86. See Milik, Ten Years of Discovery, pp. 91, 93, for the argument opposing the theory of abandonment.

[3] See Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 227; Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 81-83; Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 650; and North, "The Damascus of Qumran Geography," PEQ, LXXXVII (1955), 34-48. Cross and North offer particularly cogent arguments for this position.

[4] North, "Damascus of Qumran Geography," pp. 36 ff.

Having examined the literature which may be ascribed with a degree of certainty to the Essenes, it is now appropriate to examine the relationship of the Essenes to the rest of Judaism during the period from 175 B.C. to A.D. 68.

Relationship of the Essenes to Palestinian Judaism

To a great extent, the history of the Essenes (insofar as it is possible to reconstruct it) has been alluded to in the previous two sections. The major task in this section is to elucidate in broad outline the whole spectrum of Palestinian Judaism for the period in which the Essenes existed and to show how the Essenes fit into this spectrum.

An early reference to the various Jewish sects is the testimony of Josephus. In his War of the Jews, he refers to three sects of philosophy (the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes). He gives a brief description of the first two and, as has already been seen, an extended commentary on the Essenes.

> For there are three philosophical sects among the Jews. The followers of the first of whom are the Pharisees; of the second the Sadducees; and the third sect, who pretends to a severer discipline, are called Essenes (Josephus War II, viii, 2).

In the Antiquities of the Jews, Josephus makes two references to Jewish sects. In one reference he reiterates the three-sect division, but in the second reference, he mentions a fourth sect founded by Judas the Galilean.

> At this time there were three sects among the Jews, who had different opinions concerning human actions; the one was called the sect of the Pharisees, another the sect of the Sadducees, and the other the sect of the Essenes (Josephus Antiquities XIII, v, 9).

> The Jews had for a great while three sects of philosophy peculiar to themselves; the sect of the Essenes, and the sect of the Sadducees, and the third sort of opinions was that of those called Pharisees; . . .But of the fourth sect of Jewish philosophy, Judas the Galilean

> was the author. These men agree in all other things with the Pharisaic notions; but they have an inviolable attachment to liberty; and they say that God is to be their only ruler and lord (Josephus *Antiquities* XVIII, i, 2, 6).

Unfortunately, Josephus states nothing about the origin or history of any of these sects nor does he suggest what the relationship between them was. Hippolytus follows the three-sect division of Josephus.[1] To a great extent, his description of the three is a further amplification of the account of Josephus. One major deviation from Josephus is the division of the Essenes into four sub-groups, one of which Hippolytus labels the Zelotae or Sicarii.

> For there is a division among them into three sorts; and the adherents of the first are the Pharisees, but of the second the Sadducees, while the rest are Essenes. . . . The Essenes have, however, in the lapse of time, undergone divisions, and they do not preserve their system of training after a similar manner, inasmuch as they have been split up into four parties. . . . The adherents of another party, if they happen to hear any one maintaining a discussion concerning God and His laws--supposing such to be an uncircumcised person, they will closely watch him; and when they meet a person of this description in any place alone, they will threaten to slay him if he refuses to undergo the rite of circumcision. Now, if the latter does not wish to comply with this request, an Essene spares not, but even slaughters. And it is from this occurrence that they have received their appellation, being denominated (by some) Zelotae, but by others Sicarii (Hippolytus *Refutation of All Heresies* IX, xiii, xxi).

Since Hippolytus was writing so long after the period of the sects (ca. A.D. 225-35), his testimony likely represents a misunderstanding of Josephus' account of the Galileans (Zealots). There is no evidence that Hippolytus had a special source for his description of the Essenes. Like Josephus, he fails to describe the origin of the various sects or their relationship to each other. Neither Philo nor Pliny mention any Palestinian

---

[1] References to Hippolytus are found in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V: *Fathers of the Third Century: Hippolytus, Cyprian, Caius, Novatian, Appendix* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965).

Jewish sects other than the Essenes.[1]

Not all scholars are willing to take the testimony of Josephus and Hippolytus at face value. In the words of one critic: "Josephus has been guilty of an over-simplification of the real situation, no doubt in the interests of his own literary presentation of Judaism."[2] The assumption is that there was a much more complex and variegated pattern of sectarianism than the three-fold (or four-fold) classification of Josephus implies. Thus, Ralph Marcus proposes a substitution for the schema of Josephus as follows:[3]

I. Extreme right--Sadducees
II. Center--Pharisees
    A. Right wing--Shammaites
    B. Middle--Hillelites
    C. Left wing--Apocalyptic Pharisees
    D. Unclassified--'Am Ha-aretz
III. Left of center
    A. Essenes
    B. Gnostics
IV. Extreme left--Zealots

William Reuben Farmer asserts that the Zealots were not a _de novo_ group as Josephus seems to imply. Rather, these Zealots were the direct spiritual heirs of the earlier Maccabees.[4] Sidney B. Hoenig criticizes Farmer and agrees with Josephus that the Zealots were Pharisees in every respect except for their philosophy of political violence.[1] Marcus objects to Josephus' lack of detail about the fate of the Essenes after A.D. 70. He believes the Essenes split into several groups after the destruction of A.D. 70; some of them joined with non-Jewish Gnostic groups to retain their identity for a longer period.[2] On the whole, the testimony of the ancient writers about Jewish sects is seen to be valuable, but of a limited nature.

---

[1] Philo does devote a book (_On the Contemplative Life_) to an Egyptian sect called the Therapeutae. In some ways (particularly the withdrawal from organized society) this group is similar to the Essenes, but there is no real evidence of a direct link between the Essenes and this group.

[2] Black, _Scrolls and Christian Origins_, p. 7.

[3] Ralph Marcus, "Pharisees, Essenes, and Gnostics," _JBL_, LXXIII (1954), 160.

[4] William Reuben Farmer, _Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period_ (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956), pp. 123-24 ff.

A number of scholars have recently attempted to reconstruct the pattern of sectarianism within Palestinian Judaism during the period from 175 B.C.-A.D. 70. This propensity for reconstruction has been stimulated by the discovery of the Qumran scrolls. From a socio-historical point of view, it is essential to pin down just what is meant by a "sect" within Judaism at this particular period. Perhaps by the time of Josephus' writing, there were clearly differentiated groups which he could label accurately "sect." However, it is increasingly apparent that these "sects" represented only a small portion of the total Jewish population in Palestine. Morton Smith suggests that prior to the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 adherence to the Pentateuch and the Temple comprised the "normative, non-sectarian" expression of Judaism. This was the Judaism of the majority of the people--the _'Am_ _Ha-aretz_. The Pentateuch, as a compromise between various groups, is of a decidedly non-sectarian nature. The formation of sects occurred as groups devoted to particular legal interpretations, and consequently to peculiar practices, sought to define themselves over against the majority of the people. These differences were often fixed by the use of a special covenant for members in the sect. To join the group often required an act of conversion.[1] Black concurs that sectarianism represented a deviation from the official religion of Torah and Temple although he is more specific about the position of the Pharisees within Judaism.

---

[1] Sidney B. Hoenig, "Book Review of Wm. R. Farmer's _Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus_," _JQR_, XLIX (1958-59), 75-80.

[2] Marcus, "The Qumran Scrolls and Early Judaism," _BR_, I (1956), 31.

> Jewish sectarianism in its pre-Christian forms can only be usefully defined, or, indeed, defined at all, as non-Pharisaic religious movements related to the Judaism of the Second Temple.[2]

Marcel Simon speaks of "official" Judaism and "marginal" Judaism. The Essenes were part of the latter category; the Pharisees were "marginal" early in their history, but then they, along with the Sadducees, became part of the former category.[3] Samuel Sandmel, to the contrary, remains unconvinced that the Pharisees were dominant prior to A.D. 70. He points out that most of the knowledge about the Pharisees comes from rabbinic (i.e., pro-pharisaic) sources. In fact, Sandmel questions whether one can legitimately speak of "normative" and "marginal" Judaism prior to A.D. 70. Rather, there seems to be a plurality of views, each of which reflects, in varying measure, prevailing dominant trends common to all.[4] While Moore's assumption that Pharisaism was the "normative" expression of Judaism prior to A.D. 70 may not be wholly accurate,[5] nevertheless, it is quite legitimate to view sectarianism as deviation from the prevailing practice at the Jerusalem Temple which may be labeled "normative" whether it reflects a mixture of Pharisaism and Sadduceeism or whether it is just an amalgamation of groups including the 'Am Ha-aretz. At the same time, more chronological as well as terminological sophistication is still needed. At what point did the Pharisees cease to be a sect and become, instead, the dominant force within the so-called "normative" expression of Judaism.[1] Since the Sadducees were always staunch supporters of Torah and Temple, should they really be classified as a sect? Were the Zealots a separatist sect or merely a more zealous branch of the Pharisees? These are problems which still remain to be solved. However, the majority of scholars are agreed that the Essenes have all the attributes (such as esoteric interpretations of the law and a special covenant) necessary to qualify them as a full-fledged sect. With this designation, the ancient historians and modern scholars agree.

---

[1] Smith, "Dead Sea Sect," pp. 355-60.

[2] Black, Scrolls and Christian Origins, p. 6.

[3] Marcel Simon, Jewish Sects, p. 9.

[4] Samuel Sandmel, "Judaism, Jesus, and Paul: Some Problems of Method in Scholarly Research," in Vanderbilt Studies in the Humanities, ed. by Richmond C. Beatty, J. Phillip Hyatt and Monroe K. Spears, I (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1951), 226-28.

[5] Moore, Judaism, I, 64-65 ff. See Smith, "Dead Sea Sect," pp. 355-56, for a critique of Moore's position.

With this somewhat tentative definition of Jewish sectarianism in mind, the next procedure is to trace briefly the origin and development of the various sects or parties and then to suggest the interrelationship of these groups.

The sectarian movement in the period 175 B.C.-A.D. 70 must be traced first through the Maccabees. The story of their original deviation from the prevailing practice at Jerusalem (ca. 168 B.C.)--which then culminated in their dominance at Jerusalem--is too well-known to be repeated here.[1] It is enough to say that the Maccabees (later called the Hasmoneans) were soon in control of the religio-political aspects of Palestinian Jewish life. The Maccabees reorganized Judaism, including the transference of the high priesthood from the old Zadokite line to their own Hasmonean line. It is apparently during this period that the Sadducees, Pharisees, and Essenes are first to be recognized. The Sadducees are usually identified with the priestly, aristocratic families. Although generally tracing their lineage through the Zadokite priesthood, the Sadducees, as astute politicians, were not averse to supporting the Hasmonean line. Most scholars believe the Pharisees and the Essenes also originated during the early Hasmonean period. When the Maccabees were vying for power, they were supported initially by the Hasidim ("the pious ones"),[2] but this group soon became disenchanted with the worldliness of the Hasmonean priesthood. The general assumption is that the Hasidim were the immediate forerunners of the Pharisees and the Essenes--the former a lay movement, the latter a predominantly priestly movement. The Essenes broke with the Temple hierarchy over the question of the legitimacy of a non-Zadokite high priest.[3] The Pharisees, however, were able to work out a compromise with the Sadducees and Hasmoneans even though the two groups had no great love for each other. This leaves the Zealots as the last major sect to be examined. Much less is known about this group than about the Pharisees, Sadducees, or Essenes. The probable similarities of this group with the earlier Maccabees have already been mentioned. Generally, the Zealots have been depicted as a war-like group which arose in fervent opposition to Roman rule. The intrigues of the various factions within this group during the final siege of Jerusalem are well known.[1] Apart from this general historical evidence, little is known about the precise nature of the Zealots. Unless one accepts the thesis of Driver and Roth affirming Zealot authorship of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Zealots have left no sectarian literature describing their beliefs. One would wish for a literature comparable to that of the Essenes or the Pharisees.[2] Although the above reconstruction is based on the best knowledge now available, the tentative nature of such an enterprise must be stressed. This is particularly true of the chronological aspects of reconstruction. As Marcel Simon quite accurately says: "A precise date cannot be assigned to the birth of Jewish sectarian life as a whole, nor to that of its various component groups."[3]

---

[1] Smith would argue that this process of becoming a party was completed by the rise of the rival houses--Hillel and Shammai--within Pharisaism during the early part of the first century A.D. See Smith, "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century," in Israel: Its Role in Civilization, ed. by Moshe Davis (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956), pp. 78-80.

---

[1] An excellent summary of the period is given in Emil Schurer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus, ed. by Nahum N. Glatzer (New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1961), pp. 13 ff.

[2] The Hasidim were noted for their emphasis on personal piety and their zeal for the law. They are mentioned as one-time allies of the Maccabees (I Macc. 2:42).

[3] See Bertil Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament (Cambridge: The University Press, 1965), pp. 14-15, for an excellent summary of this aspect of Essenic doctrine.

The basic sociological difference between the Essenes and the other sect groups mentioned seems to focus on the degree of participation in the given social order. The orientation of the Essenes was essentially eschatological. Participation in the present order was futile; only a radical break with present structures could preserve the integrity of the group which truly sought to respond to the will of God. Contrariwise, the Sadducees, the Pharisees, and the Zealots all felt active participation in the on-going political process in Jerusalem was essential. To be sure, there were varying tactics advocated by each group. The Zealots, for example, were against any collaboration with the Romans; the Sadducees collaborated when it suited their purposes; the Pharisees were willing to acquiesce only in "non-religious" matters.[1] The point is that all three felt compelled to vie for temporal power. The Essenes preferred to go their own way by removing themselves from the arena of political intrigue; they were content to anticipate their role in bringing about a new order at the time of the ever-closer eschaton.[2] However, the Essenes did not live in a vacuum. There was certainly some interaction between them and the other sects. (This would have been particularly true of those Essenes who lived in the towns and villages away from Qumran.) Marcus believes there was a close relationship between the Essenes and the left wing of the Pharisees, the so-called "Apocalyptic Pharisees."[3] Milik claims that a group of these Pharisees, persecuted by John Hyrcanus ca. 110 B.C., fled to Qumran for sanctuary.[4] However, the relationship of the Essenes to the

---

[1] See Josephus War IV, iii-VI, ix, for a complete description of the siege.

[2] Although most of the rabbinic literature was written after A.D. 70, it is apparent that Pharisaic thought provided the basis for the literature of the Tannaim. See Joseph Bonsirven, Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ, trans. by William Wolf (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), pp. ix-xi; and Marcel Simon, Jewish Sects, p. 29.

[3] Marcel Simon, Jewish Sects, p. 17.

---

[1] See Förster, Palestinian Judaism, pp. 89-90.

[2] This is the central theme of the War Scroll in which the Essenes are portrayed as playing the major human role in bringing about the new order at the end of the present era.

[3] Marcus, "Pharisees, Essenes, and Gnostics," p. 158.

[4] Milik, Ten Years of Discovery, pp. 89, 145.

Hasmoneans, the Sadducees, and any of the Pharisaic elements which supported the non-Zadokite high priesthood was an embittered one. The literature of the Essenes (especially the biblical commentaries) testifies to the enmity between the supporters of the "illegal priesthood" and the followers of the "true priestly line." The relationship of the Essenes to any gnostic sects is almost impossible to ascertain despite the assurances of Marcus.[1] The whole question of the precise nature of Jewish gnostic sects is still very much confused.

The relationship of the Essenes to the rest of Judaism is, then, best characterized as "strained." The Essenes were willing to accept all Jews who would follow the strict Essenic discipline, but the tenor of their literature indicates that the Essenes did not fraternize with any who were hostile to their teachings and practices. It is significant that the Essenes remained aloof from other Jews. This separatism allowed, indeed encouraged, the Essenes to develop their doctrinal views separately from the rest of Judaism.

---

[1] Marcus, "Pharisees, Essenes, and Gnostics," p. 161. He believes gnostic elements in Essenic literature (e.g., dualism) demonstrate that the Essenes were closely akin to Jewish gnostics theologically. See also Isaiah Sonne, "A Hymn against Heretics in the Newly Discovered Scrolls and Its Gnostic Background," HUCA, XXIII (1950-51), 225-313.

CHAPTER III

THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION AND ITS VOCABULARY

The Vocabulary of Election in Current Debate

What Hebrew words are used to convey the doctrine of election in the literature of the Old Testament? Conversely, what is the understanding of election which these words convey? These two questions must be considered jointly. The following sub-sections present the views of scholars who have dealt with both of these questions together. There are, of course, many good studies which deal with the doctrine of election only and exclude any significant discussion of the Hebrew vocabulary of election; these will be included in the following analysis where pertinent. The studies of Vriezen, Koch, and Altmann (the first three sub-sections) represent the broad spectrum of thought about election and election-vocabulary. The studies analyzed in the fourth sub-section represent, in varying degrees, variations on the first three positions cited. The examples cited from these studies deal with the doctrine of election prior to the time of the Chronicler.

Vriezen's Emphasis on the Centrality of בחר

For Vriezen, the "concept of election" represents an attempt, within the literature of Israel, to define more precisely the whole relationship of God and his people. Israel's existence as a people is intertwined with her continual efforts to articulate the fact of her election by God. There is an evolution in "election thought," as recorded in the Old Testament, which occurred only as a result of deep religious struggle. There are three major emphases of the doctrine of election in the Old Testament. First, it is the nature of election theology always to emphasize the love or, better yet, the grace of God as the motive for election; the people Israel do not possess any special worth to demand this election. Election means always a choice by God. Second, election is always for a particular purpose or goal.

> Die Erwahlung ist im A.T. immer Die Sache Gottes seiner Gnade, und entholt fur den Menschen immer einen Auftrag; und nur von diesem Auftrag aus darf der Mensch die Erwahlung Gottes erfassen.[1]

Third, there is a sense in which the elect group is "taken out" or separated from the rest of mankind. However, this "separation" is not an end in itself; rather, it is a way of insuring that the particular purpose for Israel will be realized. Election brings no special virtue or competence to the elect people. Never does Israel's election mean that God has, for that reason, automatically rejected all other nations.[2]

Having established a basic definition of the doctrine of election, Vriezen then suggests that there is only one verb in the Old Testament which adequately expresses the concept of election; that word is בחר . He portrays בחר as a "theological critical idea" ("*theologisch-kritischen Begriff*") which is all inclusive. Other Hebrew words, such as ידע , קרא , or לקח , may express some particular aspect of election, but they are used on a limited basis to convey a special interpretation of election. Only בחר seems to carry all the implications of the doctrine of election. Vriezen notes that בחר was first connected with the concept of the "people of God" by deuteronomic writers. He further believes the doctrine of election appears rather late in the history of the Old Testament--perhaps as late as the Deuteronomist. By contrast, he feels that the idea of a covenant between God and the people Israel was expressed long before the doctrine of election was developed. After the Deuteronomist, the entire spectrum of ideas concerning election was then further developed by the author of Second Isaiah. Vriezen portrays בחר as a "*nominalbildung*" word which covers a variety of election meanings in a fashion which no other Hebrew word can approximate. Although Vriezen calls attention to various references to individuals (kings, priests, Levites) or to locations (Jerusalem), he is more inclined to emphasize the meaning of בחר as referring to the election of the people of Israel. In general, any other Hebrew verbs are secondary to בחר in terms of conveying the essential meaning of the doctrine of election.[1]

---

[1] Vriezen, *Erwählung Israels*, p. 109.

[2] *Ibid*., pp. 41-42.

Koch's Emphasis on the "*Wort-feld*" of בחר

Koch begins with an a priori assumption that בחר is the election word par excellence; he then proceeds to analyze all occurrences of this word in the Psalms, Deuteronomy, and Second Isaiah. On the basis of this analysis, he sees "election thought" expressed in the credo-hymns of Psalms, in the paranetic laws of Deuteronomy, and in the salvation oracles of Second Isaiah. Koch acknowledges that there are different understandings of election in these three books, but the "*wort-feld*" or "scope of the concept" of בחר is sufficiently broad to bear a variety of meanings.

---

[1] *Ibid*., pp. 36-40.

The important aspect of Koch's thought is his emphasis on the evolution of בחר. At various points in the literature of Israel, it referred to patriarchs, kings, priests, places, or the people. All of these different usages are equally legitimate extensions of this verb. He places great emphasis on the use of בחר in Deuteronomy and Second Isaiah, especially since it expresses the election of the people.[1]

The belief in Israel as an unique people came as a logical consequence of belief in an unique, all-powerful God. Although the concept of the election of the patriarchs may have evolved earlier, the main thrust of election thought, i.e., election of the people, blossomed in the late pre-exilic and exilic periods.[2]

Both Koch and Vriezen agree on the major significance of בחר for the doctrine of election. However, Vriezen is willing to concede that other verbs may convey at least some of the meaning implicit in בחר ; Koch, by assumption, eliminates other verbs from consideration. Both scholars begin from different points. Vriezen works from a general theological statement on election to a consideration of specific vocabulary. Koch works from a very limited vocabulary to a general understanding of election. Both agree on the pivotal position of Deuteronomy with respect to the development of the concept of the people Israel as elect.

Altmann's Critique of Vriezen and Koch

Altmann criticizes both Vriezen and Koch for their failure to emphasize the relationship between the whole of Old Testament theology and the "election principle." From Altmann's perspective, both scholars treat the doctrine of election as if it were in a vacuum. Altmann seeks to remedy this deficiency by calling attention to the role of universalism in election thought. What he labels "dynamic universalism" is inseparable from the "election principle." Throughout Israel's history there is a continual confrontation between the particularism of election and the principle of universalism. As Israel's concept of God's role in the world enlarges, so does her understanding of election expand. The relationship of Israel to Yahweh becomes, in the course of Israel's history, the relationship to the all-powerful, world God. Through this understanding, Israel thereby acquires a special relationship to all other peoples of the world. Three major themes, according to Altmann, gradually emerge: (1) Israel, because of her election by God, plays the greatest role in the world; (2) Israel has to represent God in the world; and (3) Israel is to be the channel of election for all peoples. There are, however, variations on the above themes within the literature of the Old Testament. Six patterns of election thought emerge: the universalistic-national (Amos and Jeremiah); the prophetic-national particularistic (Deuteronomy and Psalms); the priestly-prophetic (Ezekiel and the Priestly writer); the pre-exilic prophetic (Amos, Micah, Hosea, and Psalms); the eschatological universalistic (Second Isaiah); and the particularistic eschatological (Malachi and Joel).[1]

---

[1] Koch, "Geschichte Erwählungsworstellung," pp. 206-22.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 224.

For Altmann, the history of the elect people is of great significance. The above-mentioned patterns of election thought are greatly conditioned by historical circumstances. Different conditions elicit different understandings of election. He also makes an absolute distinction between covenant theology and election theology. The former is concerned with the people Israel and her God; the latter is concerned with Israel, God, and the peoples of the world.[1]

---

[1] Altmann, _Erwählungstheologie_, pp. 9-10 ff.

Altmann's approach to the doctrine of election is more like that of Vriezen than that of Koch. Altmann attempts to be much more exacting than Vriezen in isolating precise patterns of election thought, but both scholars approach the doctrine from the standpoint of patterns of thought rather than from the standpoint of occurrences of specific vocabulary (as does Koch). However, both Altmann and Koch agree in emphasizing the strong correlation between the doctrine of election and the doctrine of God. Unfortunately, Altmann fails to deal with specific election vocabulary. Part of his criticism of Vriezen and Koch, of course, is their dependence on the use of בחר for their understanding of election. Nevertheless, he fails to acknowledge that בחר does play a major role in conveying election thought within the very books listed in Altmann's six patterns. A further criticism of Altmann is his attempt to schematize election thought. As he himself admits, some of the books are a mixture of the categories which he establishes. In his rigid classification, he is applying dogmatic presuppositions to the Old Testament literature in a manner as arbitrary as that of Koch and Vriezen (whom he is seeking to refute) when they filter election thought through the word בחר. Both Altmann and Vriezen are trying to analyze the whole spectrum of election thought in the Old Testament; this is a monumental task too easily dominated by one's own presuppositions. Koch, while admittedly arbitrary in his use of בחר only, is nevertheless on safer ground methodologically.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 8.

Other Positions on the Doctrine of Election and Its Vocabulary

Most scholars agree on the centrality of בחר in the election vocabulary of the Old Testament, but there are varying opinions about how all-inclusive בחר is. The position of F. Michaeli is very similar to that of Koch; the fundamental word expressing election is בחר .[1] G. Ernest Wright is very close to this position, too, although he does believe the verb קרא becomes almost synonymous with בחר in Deuteronomy and Second Isaiah.[2] The position of Gottfried Quell tends to approximate that of Vriezen. He explains his estimate of בחר at length.

> In the later strata of the Canon from Dt. on, it is the favorite term in formulation of the fact of the divine revelation within the concept of the covenant. . . . Nowhere, not even in the pre-Dt. literature, are there any full synonyms, and our LXX findings simply indicate Hebrew roots which might be regarded as partially synonymous with בחר.[3]

Despite this unequivocal statement, Quell does admit that occasionally such verbs as ברר , ידע, לקח, or קרא may imply the concept of election. "But these phrases are historically rather than theologically orientated. The concept of election is not necessarily implied within them."[4] Jacob acknowledges the primacy of בחר , but he is inclined to upgrade the significance of other verbal expressions of election such as אהב , בדל , ידע , קנה, or קרא . He believes that particular aspects of the doctrine of election are made explicit with the help of these roots.[1] The view of Hans Wildberger is very similar. The "technical" Old Testament term for election, בחר , adequately expresses all meanings of election, but such verbs as גאל , ידע , or קנה are also legitimately part of election terminology.[2]

---

[1] F. Michaeli, "Elect," in Vocabulary of the Bible, ed. by J. J. von Allmen, trans. by P. J. Allcock *et al*. (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958), p. 96. Zobel concurs in this judgment. See Hans-Jurgen Zobel, "Ursprung und Verwurzelung des Erwählungsglaubens Israels," ThL, XCIII (1968), 1-4.

[2] G. Ernest Wright, "Erwählung," in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, ed. by Kurt Galling (3rd ed.; 6 vols.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1958), II, 611.

[3] Gottfried Quell, "ἐκλέγομαι," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, trans. and ed. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (7 vols.; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967), IV, 146.

[4] *Ibid*., p. 148.

Some studies have been devoted exclusively to exploring the nominal forms of Old Testament election terminology. Otto Bachli, for example, deals with references in Deuteronomy to Israel as an עם קדוש , עם סגלה , עם נחלה . He also emphasizes Israel as קהל called into being through the covenant with Yahweh as mediated by Moses.[3] Much the same emphasis is suggested by A. R. Hulst. However, he believes that Israel as עם became Israel as קהל through the summons of Moses to enter into a covenant with Yahweh whereas Bachli does not make this distinction.[4] Dahl deals with only one election principle, Israel as the עם יהוה , which he believes to be the overarching principle of Old Testament theology.[5] His methodological approach to the doctrine of election is very similar to that of Vriezen except that he substitutes a nominal form for a verbal form. Staerk emphasizes references to the people Israel as סגלה and עם קדוש. He maintains that the high-point of Old Testament election theology, of which these expressions are most typical, is to be found in Deuteronomy.[1] Jacob contends that terms which designate the people of Israel, such as עם קדוש , express divine election. For him, too, Deuteronomy represents the high-point of election theology. He concludes that references to the people, e.g., סגלה , ממלכת כהנים , and גוי קדוש (Exod. 19:5), must, therefore, be deuteronomic additions.[2] (It is interesting to note that some scholars regard this passage as the basic proclamation of the "election of Israel.")[3] Finally, some scholars regard עבד as a nominal form which expresses the concept of election, particularly in Second Isaiah.[4]

---

[1] Jacob, Theology, pp. 201-2.

[2] Hans Wildberger, Jahwes Eigentumsvolk: Eine Studie zur Traditionsgeschichte und Theologie des Erwählungsgedankens (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1960), pp. 108-10.

[3] Otto Bächli, Israel und die Völker: Eine Studie zum Deuteronomium (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1962), pp. 133-34, 141-45.

[4] A. R. Hulst, "Der Name 'Israel' im Deuteronomium," OS, IX (1951), 89.

[5] Dahl, Das Volk Gottes, pp. 5-7.

The above-mentioned scholars, while devoting careful attention to the vocabulary of election, are also very much concerned with the doctrine of election as it pertains to the covenantal concept and as it is related to the principle of universalism. Contrary to the opinion of Altmann, most scholars affirm a very strong link between the concepts of election and covenant.[5] The covenant becomes the visible form through which belief in the fact of election is expressed. As Jacob expresses it:

> Election constitutes the fundamental event, but, so that it may be a dynamic reality, it is exercised within the framework of a

---

[1] Staerk, "Erwählungsglauben," pp. 5, 8 ff.

[2] Jacob, Theology, pp. 203-4.

[3] See Galling, Erwählungstraditionen Israels, p. 56; and Wildberger, Jahwes Eigentumsvolk, p. 9.

[4] See Jacob, Theology, pp. 204-5; and Wright, "Erwählung," p. 611.

[5] See Claus Schedl, "Bund und Erwählung," ZKTh, LXXX (1958), 493; Wildberger, Jahwes Eigentumsvolk, pp. 113-17; and Wright, "Erwählung," p. 611.

> covenant. The covenant makes a restriction of the election, for, if the latter keeps Israel's looks turned towards the other people from among whom and for whose salvation Israel was chosen, the covenant insists on the bond which unites the people to their God.[1]

Claus Schedl concurs with Jacob: "Der 'Bund' ist die aussere Form, in der die 'Erwahlung' sichtbare Gestalt annimmt."[2] Wildberger emphasizes (contra Vriezen) that election precedes the proclamation of the covenantal law.[3] Others attest to the primacy of election by tracing Israel's concept of election to the earliest historical acts which God performed in her behalf.[4] The covenant then becomes an acknowledgment of these acts. Thus, election and covenant are not viewed as antithetical in any sense.

None of the scholars mentioned so far are willing to affirm, with Altmann, such a broad confrontation between particularism and universalism. However, several do speak to the issue of particularism and universalism. As has been seen, Altmann implies that particularism (election) and universalism are antithetical. His six patterns of election are reflective, in varying ways, of a confrontation between these two principles. Quell prefers to view election theology as a natural consequence of the encounter, within the history of Israel, between nationalism and the belief in a universal God. He concedes that the "nationalistic element" is very much a part of the doctrine of election, but, at the same time there is a very strong tendency toward a universalism within election thought. He suggests that Second Isaiah is the best blend of the two elements.[1] Whereas Altmann believes the doctrine of election to be a restrictive, narrowing concept, Quell affirms that it includes both the restrictive and the broader view of Israel and her place in the world. As the people of Israel reflected on the meaning of their own particular history, they were able to expand their concept of election to include the whole world. "The concept of election thus underlies and sustains the idea of universal salvation history, i.e., history as the place of God's revelation."[2] The testimony of Quell is very persuasive. His argument seems to be particularly cogent when the role of the servant in Second Isaiah is considered. Certainly, the concept of a particular people, Israel, serving to bring God's salvation to the world, portrays the great scope within the literature of the Old Testament which the doctrine of election can encompass. Election need not be considered as particularism only and thereby projected as the antithesis of universalism.

---

[1] Jacob, *Theology*, p. 209.

[2] Schedl, "Bund und Erwählung," p. 493.

[3] Wildberger, *Jahwes Eigentumsvolk*, p. 113.

[4] See Bächli, *Israel und die Völker*, pp. 139-40; and Quell, "Ἐκλέγομαι," pp. 159-60.

Summary

The preceding analysis demonstrates a variety of understandings about the nature of the doctrine of election as well as some debate over the identification of election vocabulary. The major consensus on the vocabulary of election graviates toward the centrality of בחר . A further significant factor is the frequent citing of passages in Deuteronomy and Second Isaiah. These two books represent, for most of the scholars mentioned, the epitome of the doctrine of election in the Old Testament.

---

[1] Quell, "Ἐκλέγομαι," p. 167.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 164.

The next section will establish the vocabulary of election which will serve as the basis for comparison in chapters four and five. The work of scholars cited in the present section will provide the basis for the determination of election vocabulary. In addition, other pertinent vocabulary will be suggested.

The Basic Vocabulary of the Doctrine of Election

Verbal Forms

The work of the preceding section has shown that there is scarcely any debate about the significance of the verb בחר to an understanding of the Old Testament understanding of election. It is the *sine qua non* of the doctrine of election. The word בחר occurs in excess of 150 times throughout the Old Testament; it appears frequently in Deuteronomy and Second Isaiah. There are 23 occurrences of בחר in the Chronicler[1] and 33 in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[2] It may be said quite accurately that the uses of בחר in the Old Testament are limited to works produced during and after the period of the deuteronomic editors. Generally translated "to choose, select," בחר can refer to a human choice as well as to the divine choice of a particular object.[3]

Another verb used to express the doctrine of election is ידע.

---

[1] Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, pp. 208-9.

[2] See Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, p. 31; and "Nachtrage," p. 183, for a complete list of these occurrences.

[3] See Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (corrected reprint; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1953), pp. 103-4; and Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, eds., *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (2 vols.; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1951), I, 117-18.

There are numerous appearances of this verb throughout the Old Testament. It occurs 38 times in the Chronicler and 118 times in the Qumran literature.[1] It is used primarily in connection with a human perception or affirmation; it is translated simply "to know." On these occasions when deity is the subject of the verbal form, it may be translated "God takes notice of, regards, knows" the object of election.[2] The classic use of ידע to express the fact of election is in Amos 3:2 where the people of Israel are held accountable for their sins because God has "known" them out of all the peoples of the earth.

The verb לקח occurs throughout the Old Testament, but the few uses of the verb to express the fact of election by God are limited to deuteronomic and post-deuteronomic passages. When used as a part of election vocabulary, it may be translated "to select, choose," but generally it is translated "to take, seize."[3] לקח is found 39 times in the Chronicler and 20 times in the Qumran literature.[4]

Occasionally קרא is used to indicate a "call" or "summons" of the elect group, but more often it refers to the call of a human to another human or to deity.[5] However, G. E. Mendenhall is quite right to assert:

---

[1] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 572-80; and Kuhn, Konkordanz, pp. 84-85; "Nachtrage," p. 197.

[2] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 394. See also Herbert B. Huffmon, "The Treaty Background of Hebrew Yāda'," BASOR, #181 (February, 1966), 31-37; Huffmon and Simon B. Parker, "A Further Note on the Treaty Background of Hebrew Yāda'," BASOR, #184 (December, 1966), 36-38. Huffmon deals particularly with the recognition of Israel by Yahweh through the covenantal relationship.

[3] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 543; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, II, 485.

[4] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, p. 738; and Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 112; "Nachtrage," p. 203.

[5] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, pp. 985-96.

"Since Deutero-Isaiah, the religious concept has become almost synonymous with election."[1] A typical use of קרא to indicate the fact of election is Hosea 11:1 where election is linked with a historical act of salvation. An ordinary word, קרא, thus acquires special significance through the naming of salvation as the basis for the calling.[2] The verb is found throughout the Old Testament (39 times in the Chronicler). It occurs 20 times in the Essene literature.[3]

Also used occasionally to express the doctrine of election is אהב, "to love." Quell suggests that by the time of the writing of Deuteronomy the concept of God's love for Israel had become dogma. He further affirms: "Naturally, we do not find in the OT any direct expressions of a love of God which reaches beyond Israel.[4] This verb occurs throughout the Old Testament, but it is especially prevalent in Deuteronomy and in deuteronomic passages of other books. It only occurs twice in Second Isaiah and 3 times in the Chronicler's composition.[5] It appears rather frequently (23 times) in the Qumran literature.[6] A good example of its use to express the election of the people is found in Hosea 11:1.

---

[1] G. E. Mendenhall, "Call, Calling," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. by George Arthur Buttrick et al. (4 vols.; New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), I, 490.

[2] K. L. Schmidt, "Καλέω," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, III, 491.

[3] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 1269-76; and Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 195.

[4] Quell, "Ἀγαπάω," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, I, 34.

[5] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 28-29.

[6] Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 3; "Nachtrage," p. 177.

The verb, בדל , generally translated "to separate," is not common in the Old Testament. Its 41 appearances are found mostly in Deuteronomy, in priestly passages in the Pentateuch, and in the Chronicler's work (13 times); it does not appear in Second Isaiah at all.[1] There are 27 occurrences of בדל in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[2] When used to express election, the usual emphasis is on the principle of separation of the elect from the non-elect.[3]

The verbs discussed so far--namely, בחר , ידע , לקח , קרא , אהב , and בדל --are those most commonly associated with the doctrine of election in the Old Testament. There are other verbs whose appearance in the Old Testament is infrequent or whose use to express election is infrequent. Nevertheless, their being used to express election, even though infrequently, justifies their inclusion for consideration here.

An uncommon word, ברר , can be translated (in the Qal) "to select, choose."[4] It only occurs 15 times in the entire Old Testament and 8 times in the Qumran literature. Of the Old Testament occurrences, only 7 are found in the Qal; of these, 4 are found in the Chronicler's work.[5]

The Hiphil of חזק, which is generally translated "to hold, seize, take hold of," can refer to God's relationship to the elect.[6] The verb appears in the Hiphil over 100 times throughout the Old Testament. There are 5 occurrences in Second Isaiah and 42 appearances in the work of the Chronicler, but the verb appears in the Hiphil only twice in Deuteronomy. Of the 42 occurrences in the Chronicler, 39 are found in Nehemiah.[1] There are 55 appearances of חזק in the Dead Sea Scrolls, of which 18 are Hiphil and the rest are Qal.[2]

---

[1] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, p. 178.

[2] Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 28.

[3] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 95; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, I, 109.

[4] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 141; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, I, 156.

[5] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, p. 289; and Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 38.

[6] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 305.

A verb which can be used to link the doctrine of election with historical acts is פדה. It is generally translated "to ransom, redeem," and it refers to God's redemption of his people from Egypt as well as from exile.[3] Although it appears 53 times in the Old Testament (most frequently in Deuteronomy), it is found only once in Second Isaiah and 3 times in the Chronicler's composition.[4] There are 7 appearances of פדה in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[5]

The verbs גאל and קנה are very closely related to each other in meaning when they are used to express the idea of election. Both can be used to indicate the idea of God's "redeeming" his people Israel.[6] (Hence, both are similar in usage to פדה .)[1] Although both appear rather frequently in the Old Testament (50 appearances of גאל and 67 appearances of קנה), neither appears in Deuteronomy. The verb גאל is used often in Second Isaiah, but it is not found in the Chronicler's work.[2] The verb קנה appears only once in Second Isaiah and 4 times in the Chronicler.[3] Both verbs are rare in the Qumran literature (2 appearances of גאל and only 1 appearance of קנה).[4]

---

[1] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 474-75.

[2] Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 70; "Nachtrage," p. 193.

[3] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 804; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, II, 752.

[4] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, p. 1145.

[5] Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 174; "Nachtrage," p. 218.

[6] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, pp. 145, 889; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, I, 163; II, 843; See also A. R. Johnson, "The Primary Meaning of √ גאל," Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, ed. by G. W. Anderson et al., I (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953), 75-77.

All of the verbs suggested above are used to testify to the initial fact of election or to subsequent affirmations of the belief in the fact of election. In all of them, it is possible, though not necessary, for the fact of election to be connected with particular historical events which are viewed as acts of salvation. The only possible exception to this general statement is the verb בדל . It seems to reflect more the implications or demands of the fact of election than the initial "call" itself.

The following sub-section is designed to examine the nominal forms of election vocabulary, especially the various appellations assigned to the recipients of election.

Nominal Forms

The most common name given the elect group is ישראל . The noun appears innumerable times throughout the Old Testament. It is found over 350 times in the Chronicler. There are over 100 examples of ישראל in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[1] It is used in a variety of ways. Sometimes, the word is a geographical reference to the territory of the northern tribes or to the tribes themselves; at other times, it refers to a religio-ethnic entity composed of all the people in both the northern and southern kingdoms (or tribes) or just those who live in the southern kingdom or just those in the northern kingdom.[2] When used in the religio-ethnic sense, ישראל becomes the fellowship of all those who worship the one true God.[3] Von Rad emphasizes the sacral nature of ישראל. Originally, it denoted the totality of the elect of God, i.e., those united in the Yahweh cult. Only after the break-up of the social amphictyony was the term used in a geographical sense.[4] It is often used in combination with other words, e.g., בני ישראל or עם ישראל, but here, too, the reference can be geographical or religio-ethnic.

---

[1] The verbs גאל and פדה should probably be regarded as interchangeable both in the biblical literature and in later Hebraic literature. See F. Buchsel, "Λυτρόω," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, IV, 350; and R. C. Dentan, "Redeem, Redeemer, Redemption," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, IV, 22.

[2] Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, p. 299.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 1263.

[4] Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, pp. 40, 194; "Nachtrage," p. 186.

The nominal form גוי ("people, nation") is common throughout the Old Testament, but it is especially prominent in Deuteronomy and the major prophets. There are 26 occurrences in the Chronicler, of which 19 are found in Chronicles.[5] The word appears over 50 times in the Qumran

---

[1] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 1627-30; and Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 94; "Nachtrage," p. 199.

[2] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 975; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, I, 407-8.

[3] Kuhn, "Ἰσραήλ," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, III, 357.

[4] Von Rad, "Ἰσραήλ," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, III, 357.

[5] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 314-18.

Scrolls.[1] Although it usually refers to the heathen nations in contrast to the people of Israel, it can on occasion refer to all "Israel" or even to "Judah." As a rule, though, exilic and post-exilic occurrences of גוי refer to non-Israelites.[2] The plural form גוים is used in a general way to refer to gentiles. In these cases, "The word is used non-sociologically to describe all the individuals who do not belong to the chosen people."[3]

Another noun often used to describe the elect group is עם. It is usually translated "people, nation" and is quite similar in meaning to גוי.[4] However, עם refers to the elect group far more frequently than does גוי. It is often used in combination with other nouns, e.g., עם נחלה , עם סגלה , עם יהוה . It has been suggested that the phrase "people of God" had its origin in the cultic institution of holy war; the theory is that the assembly of able-bodied men gathered for war was called the עם יהוה .[5] In general practice, עם can be used to refer to a part of a nation or people rather than to the whole.[6] However, it usually designates the whole elect people which includes women and children as well as men. The noun is used extensively throughout the Old Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls (231 and 111 times, respectively).[1]

---

[1] Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 43; "Nachtrage," p. 186.

[2] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 156; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, I, 174. See also Baumgartner, ed., Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament (2 vols.; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), I, 175. (This work is the third edition of Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon.)

[3] Georg Bertram, "Ἔθνος," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, II, 367.

[4] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, pp. 766-67.

[5] See J. A. Wharton, "People of God," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, III, 727.

[6] Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, II, pp. 710-11.

The nouns נחלה and סגלה are very similar in meaning. Both may be translated as "property" when referring to God's ownership of the chosen people.[2] However, נחלה can also refer to Yahweh's ownership of the land as well as the people. The נחלה is that share of the world which Yahweh allots to himself; it will always be his. In the words of one commentator:

> Thus pious Israelites, in faith regarding their people and land as Yahweh's נחלה , could link with this conviction all the feelings of love, loyalty and concern associated elsewhere with the נחלה of the fathers.[3]

Although scattered throughout the Old Testament, נחלה is particularly prominent in Deuteronomy. The word occurs only 3 times in Second Isaiah and 4 times in the Chronicler.[4] There are 14 uses of נחלה in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[5] The noun סגלה, by contrast, is used only 8 times in the Old Testament, 1 time in the Chronicler and 3 times in Deuteronomy. The noun is not found in either Second Isaiah or the Qumran scrolls. It is interesting to note that all the references in Deuteronomy are עם סגלה

---

[1] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 1074-80; and Kuhn, Konkordanz, pp. 164-65; "Nachtrage," p. 215.

[2] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, pp. 635, 688; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, II, 607-8, 649.

[3] J. Herrmann, "Κληρονόμος," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, III, 775.

[4] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 916-18.

[5] Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 142; "Nachtrage," p. 210.

whereas the remaining Old Testament references are simply סגלה.[1] Also noteworthy is the fact that סגלה is always used in the Old Testament to refer to the elect group only; this is not true of נחלה.

The position of the chosen people before God is often symbolized by the noun עבד ("servant"). In particular, it is often used in connection with the special mission the people of Israel have to the nations.[2] When עבד is used to describe the elect people, the term always implies an exclusive relationship between deity and people.[3] There are numerous occurrences of עבד throughout the Old Testament with especially heavy concentration in the Chronicler's work and, of course, Second Isaiah. The word occurs 96 times in the Chronicler and 35 times in the Qumran literature.[4]

The noun פליטה is often used in conjunction with שאר or שארית. It can be used to define the elect group as an escaped remnant. This is particularly true of survivors out of Judah, e.g., Isaiah 37:31-32.[5] The word does not appear in either Deuteronomy or Second Isaiah, but it does appear 9 times in the Chronicler's work.[6] There are 11 occurrences of פליטה in the Qumran literature.[7]

---

[1] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, p. 988.

[2] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 714; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, II, 671-72.

[3] Karl H. Rengstorf, "Δοῦλος," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, II, 268.

[4] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 1011-17; and Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 154; "Nachtrage," p. 213.

[5] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 812.

[6] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, p. 1156.

[7] Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 177.

The nouns שאר and שארית --these terms are interchangeable--are usually translated "rest, remnant" often with specific reference to the purified remnant of the people Israel. They can refer to the remnant of all Israel, or to the northern kingdom only, or to Judah only. As mentioned, often the term פליטה is used in parallelism with these two terms.[1] V. Herntrich has suggested that the "remnant concept" in the Old Testament implies both God's judgment and his salvation. The Old Testament says nothing about the quality of faith or the holiness of the remnant. "The remnant has its origin, not in the quality of those saved, but in the saving action of God."[2] The idea of the "remnant" as the elect is not significant in either Deuteronomy or Second Isaiah.[3] The only appearance of either term is 1 occurrence of שארית in Isaiah 46:3. In Isaiah 1-39, the concept is emphatically promulgated. The elect remnant is defined in such passages as Isaiah 10:20-22. In the Chronicler's work, שאר is used 10 times and שארית appears 6 times.[4] For the Qumran scrolls, the corresponding figures are 3 and 15, respectively.[5]

When used as a noun, קדוש can refer to particular persons or to a group of persons, i.e., "holy ones."[1] This noun is primarily a cultic term which describes the quality of the relationship between God and his chosen people. Because God (who is holy) dwells in the midst of his people, Israel, too, is to be an עם קדוש.[2] The most frequent occurrences in the Old Testament are found in Leviticus, Isaiah, and the Psalms. It occurs only 7 times in Deuteronomy and 4 times in the work of the Chronicler.[3] There are 37 occurrences of קדוש in the Essene literature.[4]

---

[1] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 984; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, II, 938-39.

[2] V. Herntrich, "Λεῖμμα," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, IV, 203.

[3] E. W. Heaton contends that for the writer of Second Isaiah the idea of a remnant was too much dependent on the past acts of redemption rather than on the future ones which the ancient writer preferred to emphasize. See Heaton, "The Root שאר and the Doctrine of the Remnant," JThS, III (1952), 31.

[4] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 1394-95.

[5] Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 215.

The noun קהל is used to refer to the "congregation" or "assembly" of the people. The most significant קהל of the Old Testament is the "Assembly of Israel" before God at Mt. Horeb (Dt. 4:10; 9:10; 10:4; 18:16).[5] The word is often used to refer to the restored post exilic community in Jerusalem.[6] Consequently, it is very prominent in the work of the Chronicler (42 occurrences). There are no occurrences of קהל in Second Isaiah.[7] The word is used 16 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[8]

The noun עדה, like קהל, is also translated "congregation."

---

[1] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 872; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, II, 822.

[2] See Otto Procksch, "Ἅγιος," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, I, 91.

[3] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 1235-36.

[4] Kuhn, Konkordanz, pp. 190-91; "Nachtrage," p. 223.

[5] This is the contention of P. S. Minear, "Church, Idea of," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, I, 608.

[6] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 874; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, II, 829.

[7] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 1234-44.

[8] Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 190; "Nachtrage," p. 223.

However, there is some question as to whether the two are synonymous.[1] One fact is certain; the term עדה is typical of priestly writings.[2] It does not appear in Deuteronomy or Second Isaiah, yet there is a heavy concentration of occurrences in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. Often, it appears in the phrase עדת ישראל . There is only 1 occurrence in the Chronicler.[3] The term appears to be a favorite term for the elect in the post-exilic priestly community although this usage does not extend to the Chronicler's circles.[4] There are 83 occurrences of עדה in the Qumran literature.[5]

In addition to the above-mentioned nouns, there are other terms relevant to the doctrine of election which appear frequently in the Essene literature but whose appearance in the Chronicler's work is of little significance. These nouns include: אביון, בחיר, יחד, סוד, and עד. Of these, only בחיר and עד can be considered as part of the vocabulary of election in Old Testament literature.

---

[1] Minear, "Church, Idea of," p. 608, implies that the two terms are not identical. However, Pope maintains that: "The distinction, if any, between עדה and קהל is difficult to determine." See M. H. Pope, "Congregation, Assembly," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, I, 670. Others concurring with Pope include: Schmidt, "Εκκλησία ," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, III, 524; and Wolfgang Schrage, "συναγωγή," in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. by Gerhard Friedrich (7 vols.; rev. ed.; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1964), VII, 802.

[2] See Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 417.

[3] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, pp. 1027-28.

[4] For a further treatment of this subject, see Bernhard Luther, "Kahal und 'edah als Hilfsmittel der Quellenscheidung im Priesterkodex und in der Chronik," ZAW, LVI (1938), 44-63.

[5] Kuhn, Konkordanz, pp. 156-57; "Nachtrage," p. 213.

There are 14 appearances of בחיר in the Old Testament, most of which occur in the Psalms and Isaiah 40-66. There is only 1 occurrence of בחיר in the Chronicler. The word does not appear in Deuteronomy.[1] It always refers to the "elect" or "chosen" of God. Typical are such passages as Isaiah 42:1; 43:20; 45:4 or Psalm 106:23 in which either the people Israel or an individual is described as the elect.[2] In the Qumran scrolls, בחיר occurs 21 times.[3]

The concept of the elect as Yahweh's "witness" (עד) is attested in Second Isaiah especially. Israel, on the basis of her experience of salvation,declares to the world the unique reality of her God (cf. Isa. 43:10, 12; 44:8). "The context of the witness is thus a religious truth of which the witness is convinced on the basis of his experience."[4] Although עד is not used in the Chronicler's composition, it appears 11 times in Deuteronomy and 6 times in Second Isaiah.[5] Most of the references in Deuteronomy define the duties of "witnesses" in legal cases; they are therefore non-relevant to the proclamation of election. There are 6 appearances of עד in the Qumran literature.[6]

The nominal forms אביון, יחד , and סוד are not used as part of the vocabulary of election in the Old Testament.[1] The noun אביון appears in various books of the Old Testament, including Deuteronomy and Second Isaiah; but it is always a description of a state of being, i.e., the "poor," rather than an honorific title for the elect. There are 16 occurrences of אביון in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[2] In its nominal form, יחד is found only twice in the Old Testament (Deuteronomy 33:5 and I Chronicles 12:18).[3] Neither usage is pertinent to the doctrine of election. Yet, in the Qumran literature, יחד appears 90 times.[4] There are 21 occurrences of סוד in the Old Testament, but none of these appearances is in Deuteronomy, Second Isaiah, or the Chronicler.[5] In no instance is סוד an Old Testament term pertaining to election.[6] This noun has 44 occurrences in the scrolls.[7] Thus, these three words, אביון , יחד , and סוד , will have to be defined as election vocabulary solely in terms of their use in the Qumran literature since there is no precedent for such definitions in the literature of the Old Testament.[8]

---

[1] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, p. 207.

[2] Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 104; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, I, 117.

[3] Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 30; "Nachtrage," p. 183.

[4] H. Strathmann, "Μάρτυς," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, IV, 484.

[5] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, p. 1026.

[6] Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 156.

---

[1] See Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, pp. 2, 403, 691; and Koehler, and Baumgartner, Lexicon, I, 4-5, 376; II, 651.

[2] Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 1.

[3] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, p. 598.

[4] Kuhn, Konkordanz, pp. 88-89.

[5] Lisowsky, Konkordanz, p. 990.

[6] See Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 691; and Koehler and Baumgartner, Lexicon, II, 651.

[7] Kuhn, Konkordanz, p. 150; "Nachtrage," p. 212.

[8] The reader is referred to the appropriate sections in chapter five.

Relationship of Verbal to Nominal Forms

On occasion, a specified verbal form has one of the specified nominal forms as a direct object with deity as the subject, e.g., בחר יהוה ישראל . This obvious expression of the doctrine of election is not always attested in the literature, however. In particular, the Chronicler's work, with its comparatively few relevant verbal occurrences, contains this type of expression infrequently. There are also a number of election passages in the Qumran literature in which relevant specified nominal forms are not the direct objects of relevant specified verbal forms. In effect, the verbal forms are necessarily connected to one of the nominal forms in any meaningful expression of the doctrine of election. However, the converse is not true. Many of the occurrences of specified nominal forms can be meaningful as expressions of election quite apart from their being either the direct object or even the subject of one of the specified verbal forms.

The Doctrine of Election Prior to the Chronicler

The purpose of the preceding section was to identify the specific vocabulary of the doctrine of election. The task of this section is to examine briefly the doctrine of election in two documents, Deuteronomy and Second Isaiah, as a prologue to the work in chapters four and five.

Deuteronomy

It has been said that the idea of election appears so frequently throughout Deuteronomy that the theology of that document is primarily "election theology."[1] Vriezen even goes so far as to say that Deuteronomy presents the first classical formulation of election theology in the literature of the Old Testament.[1] Undeniably, the fact of Israel's election is frequently mentioned (cf. Dt. 4:20; 7:6; 14:2; 21:8; 26:5), although, as Wright correctly says, in Deuteronomy the doctrine of election is closely interwoven with covenant theology so that often awareness of the fact of election is linked with a demand for strict obedience to the covenantal law.[2] It would seem more accurate to recognize that the idea of election is not new, but it is simply presented more vigorously in Deuteronomy than in earlier literature.[3] Deuteronomy was written in a time of crisis to bolster the faith of the people. The emphasis on election is designed to remind the people of their ancient heritage and to remind them of what it means to belong to Yahweh.[4] It may further be said that Deuteronomy was the first work to give a strict and precise meaning to the Israelite people and its history and to express this in a succinct form of faith. In other words, Deuteronomy represents the first major effort to link election (including the "sense of nationality") with specific historical acts; it represents a developed sense of "salvation history" (*Heilsgeschichte*). "The concept of election thus underlies and sustains the idea of universal salvation history, i.e., history as the place of God's revelation."[5] The original basis of election, then, was the recognition of the unique meaning of the history of the people of Yahweh among the nations.

---

[1] Koch, "Geschichte Erwählungsworstellung," p. 214.

---

[1] Vriezen, *Erwahlung Israels*, p. 7.

[2] Wright, "*Erwahlung*," p. 611.

[3] See Mendenhall, "Election," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, II, 76.

[4] This view is suggested by Robert Martin-Achard, "La signification théologique de l'élection d'Israël," *ThZ*, XVI (1960), 338-39.

[5] Quell, "Ἐκλέγομαι," p. 164.

There are several dominant themes in the election theology of Deuteronomy, the chief of which is the emphasis on the election of the people. Prior to the writing of Deuteronomy, the idea of election was restricted in most instances to individuals (patriarchs and kings) or places (Jerusalem or the Temple), but, as Vriezen notes, this is not the case in Deuteronomy.

> In Deuteronomy the idea of election is for the first time emphatically associated with the people. The pre-Deuteronomic authors presuppose this conception, but have not yet worked it out as a fundamental theological conception.[1]

The people, as recipients of election, are called to a new obedience within the covenantal structure so that they might become a "Holy People" and thereby become worthy of their inheritance (cf. Dt. 7:6 ff.; 14:2; 26:18-19; 28:9-10). The people are continually reminded of the historical basis of their election, i.e., the acts of salvation (Dt. 4:20; 7:8; 9:26; 15:15). A prime factor in the process of election is the realization of the promise of land made to the ancestors of the elect people (Dt. 11:8-9; 26:15). John D. W. Watts has suggested that three theological "beams" (the redemption from Egypt, the covenant at Sinai, and the promise and fulfillment of land) support the concept of Israel as the people of God.[2] Finally, the people are reminded that their election is not based on their own merit, but rather, it is because of God's promises to the fathers and his love for the elect people (Dt. 4:37;

---

[1] Vriezen, Outline of Theology, p. 48. Much the same emphasis is found in Koch, "Geschichte Erwählungsworstellung," pp. 215-16.

[2] John D. W. Watts, "The People of God: A Study of the Doctrine in the Pentateuch," ET, LXVII (1955-56), 234-36.

7:8; 10:15; 23:6).[1]

The classic statement of election is found in Deuteronomy 7.

> For you are a people holy to the Lord your God; the Lord your God has chosen you to be a people for his own possession, out of all the peoples that are on the face of the earth. It was not because you were more in number than any other people that the Lord set his love upon you and chose you, for you were the fewest of all peoples; but it is because the Lord loves you, and is keeping the oath which he swore to your fathers, that the Lord has brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you from the house of bondage, from the hand of Pharaoh King of Egypt. (Dt. 7:6-8).

All the elements of election are present: a holy people, a people chosen from the rest of the peoples of the earth, a people beloved of the Lord, a people redeemed through the historical process. All that remains is to spell out the desired response to this fact of election. This is done in Deuteronomy 7:11: "You shall therefore be careful to do the commandments, and the statutes, and the ordinances, which I command you this day." There is no obligation placed on the people beyond that of obedience to the law. Israel must remain a "sacred people" consecrated to, and by, the Lord.[2]

Quell has called attention to another theme of election present in Deuteronomy, namely, the tension between particularism and universalism. This tension revolves about two foci: the relationship of the people Israel to the rest of the peoples of the world; the relationship of a universal God to the particular people Israel. The question then becomes: To what extent does a universalistic God demonstrate concern about a particular people? It is the belief of Quell that the doctrine of election in Deuteronomy represents a compromise between an emphasis on nationality (particularism) and belief in a universal God.[1] Altmann, too, is well aware of the tensions in Israel's religious history. However, he views the election theme in Deuteronomy as slanted considerably in favor of a particularistic or nationalistic approach to the world. This theme he labels the "prophetic-national particularistic election tradition."[2] Both scholars accurately portray the intent of the author of Deuteronomy. Faced with the dual task of trying to maintain the allegiance of the people to Yahweh and, at the same time, trying to cope with the implications of the prophetic understanding of a universal God, the writer (or writers) developed the understanding of election found in Deuteronomy 7:6 ff.; 26:16-19; 32:43. The people Israel were a "Holy People" unlike the other peoples in the world. Therefore, the chosen people were not to risk contamination with foreign customs or foreign gods lest they cease to be worshippers of the Lord. In essence, because of God's love for them, the people had to reciprocate by hating anything antithetical to the covenant relationship with the Lord. Deuteronomy presents an understanding of election which is centered on the welfare of a particular people. There is no attempt to project the necessity for any relationship with, or mission to, the rest of the peoples of the world. God was indeed seen to be Lord of the universe, but he bestows his favors on Israel alone. Israel exists only for the sake of God and for herself.

---

[1] For further discussion of these reasons for election as given in Deuteronomy, see A. A. Solomon, "The New Testament Doctrine of Election," SJTh, XI (1958), 407-9.

[2] See Martin-Achard, "La signification," p. 335, for a discussion of Deuteronomy 7:6 ff.

The use of election vocabulary in Deuteronomy includes 17 occurrences of verbal forms in which God is the subject and Israel (or an equivalent substitute) is the object of the process of election. The verbs אהב, בחר, לקח , ידע , פדה , and קרא are used to express God's choice of the people Israel. In the passages containing אהב , בחר , לקח , and פדה , the belief in election is often linked with God's activity on behalf of Israel, especially the event of the Exodus (cf. Dt. 4:20, 37; 7:6-8; 9:26). Every occurrence of פדה emphasizes the redemption from bondage in Egypt (cf. Dt. 7:8; 9:26; 13:6; 15:15). Another emphasis found in some passages using אהב , בחר , and פדה is God's love for the fathers as a guarantee of his continued love for the descendants (cf. Dt. 4:37; 7:8; 10:15). The use of בחר is especially significant. The key passages pertaining to God's choosing the people Israel all contain this verb. The verbal form בחר takes on a new meaning in Deuteronomy as the verb par excellence expressing the fact of election, especially as this fact is articulated through the covenant relationship.[1]

---

[1] Quell, "Ἐκλέγομαι," p. 161.

[2] Altmann, Erwählungstheologie, p. 9.

Of the nominal forms, ישראל and עם are the most common titles given to the elect group. The first term is so common as to obviate further comment. In 32 occurrences, עם refers to the chosen people; the noun is applied to the non-elect in 30 instances. When referring to the elect, עם is often used in combination with other words, e.g., עם קדוש (Dt. 7:6; 14:2; 26:19; 28:9); עם סגלה (Dt. 7:6; 14:2; 26:18); עם נחלה (Dt. 4:20). In fact, קדוש is used only in combination with עם . The term גוי is used 5 times to describe the chosen people (Dt. 4:34; 8:20; 9:14; 26:5; 32:28), but it refers more often (21 times) to the non-Israelites (the non-chosen). The noun סגלה appears but 3 times in Deuteronomy; each time it is used with עם. This particular combination does not appear elsewhere in the Old Testament. Only 4 times is נחלה used with reference to the chosen people as God's heritage (Dt. 4:20; 9:26, 29; 32:9); the other uses of the word (20) all refer to the "inheritance" of land by the chosen people. The latter usage is certainly a by-product of election theology. Twice, the chosen people are referred to as "his servants;" both references are in the "Blessing of Moses" (Dt. 32:36, 43). Use of the term קהל is rather significant. Of the 11 occurrences in Deuteronomy, 7 occur in Deuteronomy 23 with specific reference to the qualifications necessary to enter the קהל יהוה. Three times reference is made to the "assembly" at Mt. Sinai (Dt. 5:22; 9:10; 10:4). Bachli believes the use of קהל, the equivalent of ישראל, emphasizes the particular process by which the people became a community through the summons of Moses to make a covenant of law.[1] Hulst agrees that the people became a קהל through the summons of Moses, but he makes a distinction between this word and ישראל. The latter represents a combined "community of faith" and "community of blood" whereas the former portrays the "community of faith" only.[2] Taking into account such a passage as Deuteronomy 27:9, it is rather difficult to accept Hulst's judgment. It will be important to note whether there appears to be any distinction between ישראל and קהל as used in the Chronicler's work and the Dead Sea Scrolls. It may well be that the term קהל is used to identify the elect group only in a context which emphasizes the responsibilities of covenant obedience. This tentative judgment, too, must be held in abeyance until chapters four and five.

---

[1] See Quell, "Ἐκλέγομαι," p. 146, for further discussion.

---

[1] Bächli, *Israel und die Völker*, pp. 133-34.

[2] Hulst, "Der Name 'Israel' im Deuteronomium," pp. 82-87, 105.

Second Isaiah

The expression of election in Second Isaiah reflects a continuing concern on the part of the people Israel to discern the precise meaning of Israel's election for the rest of the world. Although the doctrine of election found in Deuteronomy tended to express concern only for the fate of the elect people, this certainly did not mean that thoughtful members of the chosen people were unconcerned about the theological plight of the rest of humanity, i.e., the non-elect. It was logical that much theological thought was devoted to the whole question of what stance the elect people should take toward the non-elect. As Eichrodt says so well:

> The consciousness of being called to be a holy people, being God's own possession and belonging to his Kingdom, leads Israel to a knowledge of their obligation to testify to the majesty and power of their God in the world.[1]

Thus, election and concern for the non-elect (albeit from the perspective of the elect) were not seen to be complete incompatible entities. Such works as Jonah and Ruth reflected an attempt to extend the blessings of election to the non-elect.[2] Many scholars are convinced that Second Isaiah represents the epitome of an election theology tempered by a universalistic concern for the rest of the world.[3] Nevertheless, in Second Isaiah, the uniqueness of Israel's position in the world is not diminished in any way. The chosen people are still the beloved of God.

---

[1] Eichrodt, "Covenant and Law: Thoughts on Recent Discussion," trans. by Lloyd Gaston, Interp, XX, (1966), 311.

[2] See Vriezen, Outline of Theology, pp. 165-66, for the significance of Jonah and Ruth to the doctrine of election.

[3] Cf. Dahl, Das Volk Gottes, p. 26; Moore, Judaism, I, 227-29; and Vriezen, Outline of Theology, pp. 165-67.

The times in which the author of Second Isaiah was writing were even more critical than those in which Deuteronomy was written. The people were in exile in a foreign land. The old patterns of nationalistic pride, prevelant even in Deuteronomy in the continual emphasis on the promised land and the slaughter of non-Israelites, had proved illusory. An absolutely prime task for an exilic prophet was to assure the people that God had not abandoned them.[1] The people were still the elect, the chosen of God. At the same time, the elect people are called upon to assume new responsibilities to, and for, the world. Altmann has labeled this dual emphasis in Second Isaiah the "eschatological universalistic election understanding."[2] Rowley is quite right when he says:

> It is to be observed that for Deutero-Isaiah universalism did not spell the rejection of the thought of Israel's election. An election that was merely favouritism would have little in common with universalism, but an election that is concerned in terms of purpose is entirely consistent with universalism.[3]

The chosen people are assured of their own election despite the present adverse circumstances. They are precious to God; they are loved and honored by him (Isa. 43:4). Israel (Jacob) had been formed by the Lord; he will not forget his people (Isa. 43:1; 44:21; 49:1). Even the fathers are invoked to help prove the fidelity of God's love for his people

---

[1] Martin-Achard, "La signification," pp. 339-40, emphasizes this point particularly.

[2] Altmann, Erwählungstheologie, pp. 25-27. Others emphasizing the blend of particularism and universalism in Second Isaiah include: Robert Davidson, "Universalism in Second Isaiah," SJTh, XVI (1963), 174-75; and Eissfeldt, "Partikularismus und Universalismus in der israelistisch-judischen Religionsgeschichte," ThL, LXXIX (1954), 283-84.

[3] Rowley, Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 63. The same emphasis is found in Christopher R. North, Isaiah 40-55: Introduction and Commentary (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1952), pp. 52-53.

(Isa. 51:1-2). Reference is made to God's saving acts in the past as proof that he will not abandon his chosen ones now (Isa. 52:4-5). The chosen people have been redeemed from their suffering and privation (Isa. 43:1 ff.; 51:22); they shall return to their own land (Isa. 51:11). Finally, all Israel's enemies shall be put to grief; God will continue to protect his elect (Isa. 41:11-13; 43:14).

However, it is not enough for the people to be assured of their continued election by God. For Second Isaiah, the obvious corollary to the assurance of election is the demand for service in the world. The chosen people have a mission in the world; they are to be a "light unto the gentiles" (Isa. 42:6; 49:6; 55:5). The people are chosen to be God's servant and witness in the world. Israel is to be the instrument of salvation for the whole world.[1] One scholar has said of Israel's role: "The ultimate destiny of the world depends on the existence of Israel in the midst of the nations; in living by Yahweh the Chosen People lives for mankind."[2] Solomon has even suggested that in Second Isaiah the concepts of "service" and "election" are brought together for the first time in the Old Testament.[3] Rowley, on the contrary, believes all election thought is inseparable from "service." "Throughout the Old Testament the first corollary of the divine election of Israel and the deliverance of the tribes that were in Egypt is that God has a claim to Israel's service."[1] Perhaps a more accurate way to acknowledge the unique contribution of Second Isaiah is to suggest that here, for the first time, the doctrine of election is linked (in the "Suffering Servant" passages) with the concept of suffering service. The people are required even to suffer, if necessary, in order to fulfill their vocation as the elect.[2]

---

[1] Wright, "Erwählung," p. 611, discusses the role of Israel as an instrument of salvation for the world.

[2] Martin-Achard, A Light to the Nations, trans. by John Penney Smith (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962), p. 31.

[3] Solomon, "New Testament Doctrine of Election," p. 410.

There are 32 occurrences of specified verbal forms in Second Isaiah relevant to the fact of Israel's election. The verbs most frequently cited are בחר , גאל , חזק , and קרא. All passages using בחר (Isa. 41:8-9; 43:10; 44:1-2; 49:7) are linked with the idea of the choice of a servant by God. The verb גאל is used 7 times (Isa. 43:1; 44:22, 23; 48:20; 51:10; 52:3, 9), all with the implication of redemption from exile. The use of this verb tends to reiterate an emphasis on the historical acts of salvation. (This same emphasis has already been noted in Deuteronomy.) The Hiphil form of חזק is used 4 times to testify to the Lord's initiative in taking and holding Israel as his people (Isa. 41:9, 13; 42:6; 51:18). Even Cyrus, the Lord's anointed, is "grasped" for a particular task (Isa. 45:1). The verb קרא is used extensively in the Qal to testify to God's call of the elect people (e.g., Isa. 41:9; 42:6; 45:3-4; 48:13, 15; 54:6). There are also uses of קרא in the Niphal (Isa. 43:7; 48:1) and the

---

[1] Rowley, *Biblical Doctrine of Election*, p. 45. Jacob believes Second Isaiah brought the obligation of service to "complete expression." See Jacob, *Theology*, p. 208.

[2] This writer believes the "Suffering Servant" passages refer to the people Israel. See Rowley, *Biblical Doctrine of Election*, pp. 113-14, and North, *Isaiah 40-55*, pp. 29-36, for a summary of the various opinions regarding the identity of the "Suffering Servant" in Second Isaiah. Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 340-41, offers a concise argument for identifying the "Suffering Servant" with the people Israel.

Pual (48:12). The Pual form of קרא occurs elsewhere in the Old Testament only in Trito-Isaiah and Ezekiel. No other reference except Isaiah 62:2 is used to convey the fact of Israel's election.[1] Only once is אהב used to refer to the elect people (Isa. 43:4). The verb פדה appears only once in the phrase "ransomed of the Lord" (Isa. 51:11); the verse is identical to Isaiah 35:10 so the usage of פדה is not distinctive here.

The most common appellations for the chosen people are ישראל (יעקב) , עם , and עבד. The nouns ישראל and יעקב are used interchangeably throughout Deutero-Isaiah (e.g., Isa. 40:27; 41:8; 42:24; 43:22; 48:12). In one instance, ישראל is specifically identified as the עבד יהוה (Isa. 49:3). Often עם appears with the pronominal suffix ("my people" or "his people") as an expression of the relationship between God and Israel (e.g., Isa. 47:6; 51:16; 53:8; 51:22). A rather rare form occurs in Isaiah 51:4. The noun לאום , "people, nation," is used in parallelism with עם . The former is a poetical form found only in exilic and post-exilic works.[2] As might be expected, עבד plays the central role in describing the elect group. It occurs 21 times, of which 7 are found in the "Servant songs." Quite often, the pronominal suffix is attached (e.g., Isa. 41:8-9; 44:2; 43:10; 48:20). The noun עבד is used in parallelism to both ישראל and יעקב . On 3 occasions עד is used to describe the chosen people (Isa. 43:10, 12; 44:8); each usage has the first person singular pronominal suffix. The form בחיר appears 3 times. Twice it is parallel to עבד (Isa. 42:1; 45:4). Once it is combined with עם (Isa. 43:20). Only once is נחלה used to convey the fact of election. It is parallel to עם

---

[1] See Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Lexicon, p. 896.

[2] Ibid., p. 522.

(Isa. 47:6). The term גוי appears 7 times in Second Isaiah (Isa. 42:1, 6; 45:20; 49:6, 7, 22; 52:10), but it always refers to the non-elect peoples. There is no equivalent in Second Isaiah to the use of קהל in Deuteronomy.

CHAPTER IV

THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION IN THE CHRONICLER'S WORK

Occurrences of Election Vocabulary[1]

In the Chronicler's work there are 997 occurrences of the election vocabulary specified in chapter three. Of this total, 208 occurrences are verbal forms whereas 789 are nominal forms. Of more significance, however, are the number of relevant occurrences (i.e., usages expressing the doctrine of election) of the verbal and nominal forms. The number of relevant verbal usages is surprisingly low compared to the relevant nominal usages. For the former, only 26 of the 208 occurrences are relevant. The latter claims a higher percentage with 311 out of a possible 789. Of these 311 nominal forms, 262 refer to the elect group whereas 49 are applied to the non-elect. Overall, out of approximately 28,650 total vocabulary occurrences in the Chronicler's work (excluding I Chr. 1-9) there are 337 relevant occurrences of election vocabulary. This means that about 1.2% of all vocabulary occurrences are relevant to the doctrine of election.

Three of the specified verbal forms do not have relevant occurrences in the Chronicler. The verb גאל does not appear at all in the Chronicler's composition. There are 42 occurrences of חזק (38 times in Nehemiah alone with the majority of these referring to repairing the broken wall of Jerusalem) whereas קנה appears only 4 times (all with reference to purchasing land or materials).

---

[1] See Tables 1, 2, and 5 in the Appendix.

Of the verbal forms which have relevant occurrences in the Chronicler, בדל and בחר appear most frequently in this category. For בדל , 9 out of 13 appearances (both Niphal and Hiphil) are relevant. Seven out of 23 appearances are relevant in the case of בחר . It is very significant that בדל is the only specified verbal form found in Ezra (4 relevant occurrences), and it is the only verb with relevant occurrences in all three divisions of the Chronicler--Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. As for בחר, 6 out of the 7 relevant occurrences are found in Chronicles. The verbs ידע, לקח, and קרא, though appearing frequently in the Chronicler (38, 39, and 39 times, respectively), are used very sparingly to express the doctrine of election (only 2, 1, and 1 times, respectively). The remaining specified verbal forms (אהב , ברר , and פדה) do not occur very frequently. The verb אהב is found 3 times in the Chronicler of which only 1 occurrence is relevant to the doctrine of election. Out of 4 total appearances for ברר, only 2 are relevant. All 3 appearances of פדה are relevant.

The distribution of relevant verbal appearances among Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah is rather interesting. Chronicles contains 15 occurrences; Ezra has 4; and Nehemiah has 7. However, in comparison with the total vocabulary occurrences in each of these three, the ratio of relevant verbal occurrences to total vocabulary occurrences is higher in both Ezra and Nehemiah (.11% and .13%, respectively) than it is in Chronicles (.08%). In Chronicles, the largest single block of verbal occurrences (6) is reflected in בחר. The remaining 9 occurrences are scattered fairly evenly among the remaining relevant verbs with the exception of אהב (for which there is not a relevant occurrence in Chronicles). Ezra, as already mentioned, contains relevant occurrences for בדל only; the verb occurs 4 times (compared with 3 times in Nehemiah and 2 times in Chronicles). Nehemiah, apart from the 3 appearances of בדל , has its 4 remaining relevant occurrences distributed among 4 different verbs. There are no relevant appearances in Nehemiah of ברר, לקח, or קרא. By way of comparison, Chronicles has the best distribution among different verbs (7 out of 11 possible verbal forms); Nehemiah is next with 5 out of 11 possible verbs; Ezra is last with only 1 of the possible 11 verbal forms.

Of the 17 different specified nominal forms, 6 are not used to express the doctrine of election in the Chronicler's composition. Of these 6, אביון , סוד , and עד do not appear at all. The nouns יחד and סגלה appear only once each; and נחלה appears 4 times.

Four nouns account for an overwhelming proportion of the relevant occurrences--גוי (26), ישראל (143), עם (79), and קהל (42). Together, they account for 290 out of the 311 relevant nominal occurrences in the Chronicler's work. The only specified nouns used to describe both the non-elect and the elect are גוי and עם with 25 out of 26 and 24 out of 79 occurrences, respectively, being assigned to the non-elect. It is also noteworthy that every occurrence of both גוי and קהל in the Chronicler is relevant to the doctrine of election. The proportion of relevant occurrences to total occurrences for עם and ישראל is considerably lower with 79 out of 231 and 143 out of 357, respectively. The majority of non-relevant occurrences of עם are designations either for the laymen or for an assembled crowd. Most of the non-relevant occurrences of are either geographical references or part of the title "God of Israel."

The 7 remaining nominal forms only total 21 relevant occurrences between them. Their proportions of relevant occurrences to total occurrences are: בחיר (1 out of 1); עבד (7 out of 96); עדה (1 out of 1); פליכה (7 out of 9); שאר (1 out of 10); and שארית (3 out of 6). Most of the non-relevant occurrences of עבד refer to a slave or servant in a totally non-theological dimension.

Chronicles contains by far the greatest number of relevant nominal occurrences (224 compared to 47 for Ezra and 40 for Nehemiah). The ratio of relevant nominal occurrences to total vocabulary occurrences is about the same in both Chronicles and Ezra (1.1% and 1.2%, respectively). The corresponding ratio in Nehemiah is considerably lower (.75%). This high number in Chronicles is directly dependent on the nouns גוי (19 out of 26 relevant occurrences occurring in Chronicles); ישראל (107 out of 143; עם (55 out of 79); and קהל (32 out of 42). The single relevant occurrences of בחיר, עדה, and קדוש are also found in Chronicles. Only שאר appears in Nehemiah without also appearing in Chronicles. The distribution of relevant nominal appearances throughout Ezra and Nehemiah is remarkedly similar. The same words generally occur or do not occur in both. The only exceptions are שארית (which occurs once only in Ezra) and שאר (which occurs once only in Nehemiah). Ezra does contain 25 relevant occurrences of ישראל as compared with 11 in Nehemiah. Conversely, Nehemiah contains 6 relevant occurrences of גוי compared to only 1 for Ezra. The only other interesting phenomenon is the use of פליכה. This is the only noun in which the distribution is fairly even in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah (3, 4, and 1 times, respectively).

As was the case with occurrences of specified verbal forms, so, in the nominal forms as well, Chronicles contains both the highest number of relevant occurrences (224) and the best distribution among possible nominal forms (10 out of 17). However, the relatively similar composition of Ezra and Nehemiah, both in total number of relevant occurrences and in the distribution of these occurrences, is different from the situation encountered with the relevant verbal occurrences. Finally, it is important to reiterate that, of the specified nominal forms, only גוי and עם are used to describe the non-elect.

Having discussed the occurrences of the various verbal and nominal forms, the purpose of the following section will be to examine representative samples of these occurrences in order to ascertain the membership of the elect and the non-elect groups.

Identification of the Elect and the Non-Elect

The purpose of this section is to present the findings gleaned from research in the Chronicler's work pertaining to three questions: (1) Who is considered elect? (2) Who is excluded from being elect? (3) How does one become elect? For purposes of clarity, the responses to these questions will be treated in three sub-sections. Within each sub-section, examples of verbal and nominal occurrences relevant to that particular question will be cited.

Who is Considered Elect?

In Nehemiah 13:26, it is said that God loved (אהב) Solomon and made him king over all Israel. (This is the only relevant occurrence of אהב in the Chronicler.)

> Did not Solomon king of Israel sin on account of such women? Among the many nations there was no king like him, and he was loved by his God, and God made him king over all Israel (Neh. 13:26).

The verb בחר is used to indicate a variety of understandings about who is elect. God chooses Abraham (Neh. 9:7); David (I Chr. 28:4; II Chr. 6:6); the Levites and/or the priests (I Chr. 15:2; II Chr. 29:11); and even Jerusalem (II Chr. 6:6) and Judah (I Chr. 28:4). A speech by David represents a typical example of the various uses of בחר.

> Yet the Lord God of Israel chose me from all my father's house to be king over Israel forever; for he chose Judah as leader, and in the house of Judah my father's house, andamong my father's sons he took pleasure in me to make me king over all Israel (I Chr. 28:4).

This variety of definitions of the elect is found only with בחר. The other verbal forms are more limited in their identification of the elect group. Yet, despite this variety, it is significant that all these examples of election are found in contexts which emphasize directly the relationship to the people Israel of those specified as elect. The election of Abraham is mentioned because of its import for his descendants, the people Israel. David is chosen king, and Judah is chosen as leader over all Israel. Jerusalem is chosen as the center, and David is chosen as the leader, of God's people Israel. Even the priests and Levites are chosen to perform their tasks in behalf of all Israel. So, wherever בחר is not used with the people Israel as a direct object, all of its direct objects have a definite relationship to Israel which is articulated in each individual context.

In Ezra and Nehemiah, בדל is used to indicate that either the people Israel or the "congregation of the exiles" (קהל הגולה) is the elect group. Thus the Israelites (people of Israel) are urged to separate themselves from all foreigners (non-Israelites)(Neh. 9:2; 10:29; 13:3; Ezra 9:1; 10:11). This is the only way to avoid the "pollutions of heathen customs."

These passages seem to base membership in the elect group primarily on ethnic considerations. The possibility of a further qualification for membership in the elect group is suggested in Ezra 6:20-21 and 10:8 where reference is made to the returned exiles as a special entity. In the first passage, the feast of Passover is celebrated by the returned exiles and those who separated from heathen pollutions.[1]

> So they killed the passover lamb for all the returned exiles, for their fellow priests, and for themselves; it was eaten by the people of Israel who had returned from exile, and also by every one who had joined them and separated himself from the pollutions of the peoples of the land to worship the Lord, the God of Israel (Ezra 6:20-21).

In Ezra 10:8, the elect group seems somewhat more exclusive by being limited to the congregation of the exiles. No mention is made in this passage of the status of those who did not participate in the exile and subsequent return. Rather, the proclamation is made throughout Jerusalem and Judah to the returned exiles only; refusal to respond appropriately to the proclamation means forfeiture of property and excommunication from the congregation of the exiles. There is no indication of this distinction between Israelite and Israelite in the other passages containing בדל. In Chronicles, there are several references in which בדל is used to indicate the setting aside of Aaron and his descendants (I Chr. 23:13) and the Levites (I Chr. 25:1) to perform certain cultic tasks. Both references seem to represent more a consecration to a specific task than an indication of a special elect status. It is significant that in neither Ezra nor Nehemiah is there any emphasis on a separation of the clergy from the rest of the Israelites as if some special status was to be conferred on the clergy. Rather, the emphasis is on defining the elect on the basis of either ethnicity or ethnicity plus an unique, shared experience (the exile). This emphasis would seem to lend credence to an interpretation of the priestly-levitical office as purely functional with no special elect status accruing to it.

---

[1] Presumably this refers to Israelites who had not been part of the exile. There is no reason to suspect that the elect group was extended beyond ethnic boundaries to include repentant non-Jews.

The two relevant occurrences of ברר (I Chr. 9:22; 16:41) seem to be in the same category as the occurrences of בדל in Chronicles. The gatekeepers (Levites) and the priests are chosen by David, this task having divine authority according to the Chronicler; but their task and status is strictly a functional one.

> All these, who were chosen as gatekeepers at the thresholds, were two hundred and twelve. They were enrolled by genealogies in their villages. David and Samuel the seer established them in their office of trust (I Chr. 9:22).

The only relevant occurrence of לקח in the Chronicler is instructive. God takes David but for the sole purpose of being "prince over my people Israel." (I Chr. 17:7). What is obviously the election of a particular individual is used to indicate God's continual care and concern for his elect people.

The occurrences of פדה and קרא which express the doctrine of election mention only the people Israel as the elect group. In I Chronicles 17:21, the exalted position of God's people Israel before all other nations is proclaimed. This is the people whom God redeemed (פדה) from Egypt. The Chronicler continues: "And you made your people to be your people forever" (I Chr. 17:22). Nehemiah also speaks of God's people who have been redeemed (פדה) (Neh. 1:10). Of particular interest is the identity of the people described by Nehemiah. He is referring in part to those Jews in Jerusalem who had escaped going into exile. This particular context (particularly the reference in Nehemiah 1:8 to being "scattered among the peoples") suggests, of course, that Nehemiah was not just speaking of those left behind in Jerusalem alone; rather, he was speaking of all who had a common ethnic background. God speaks to Solomon of his people (Israel) who are called (Niphal form of קרא) by his name. ". . . if my people who are called by my name humble themselves, and pray and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and heal their land" (II Chr. 7:14).

Analysis of the relevant verbal forms shows that the elect are usually identified as members of an ethnic group, the people Israel. With the exception of certain passages containing בדל (Ezra 6:21; 10:8), there is no overt attempt to exclude from the elect group any who were born Israelites. Within this elect group, the priests and Levites are chosen (or set aside) to perform specific tasks. There is no legitimate reason to suggest this makes them an especially elect group. Rather, it is more accurate to suggest that the clergy, along with the laity, shared equally in the same elect status. However, one must balance this seeming willingness to regard all Israelites as part of the elect group with the realization that the demand is laid on all Israelites (in both Ezra and Nehemiah) to separate themselves from all non-Israelites (including separation from foreign wives and the children of such wives).[1] The penalty for failure to follow this dictum may well have been excommunication from the elect group (certainly the intention expressed in Ezra 10:8), but the reader is not so informed (except in Ezra 10:8). What appears to be a logical implication is not carefully spelled out. The biblical writers stop at the point where one would wish them to be more explicit.

---

[1] This separation seems to reflect an attempt to distinguish between "true Israelites" (i.e., Judeans) and ethnically mixed people such as the Samaritans.

The nominal forms are perhaps more helpful than the verbal forms in determining who is elect. The more numerous relevant nominal occurrences give greater opportunity to examine the doctrine of election in a variety of contexts.

The only occurrence of בחיר (in all of the Chronicler's work) is found in the Hymn of Asaph: "O seed of Israel his servant, sons of Jacob, his chosen ones" (I Chr. 16:13).[1] In this instance it is obvious that ethnicity (through the tracing of lineage) is the primary basis for membership in the elect group.

Only once is גוי used with reference to the elect, and even that reference is ambiguous. The MT is translated: "What one nation on earth is like your people Israel . . ." (I Chr. 17:21). The question is whether Israel is being considered a גוי here. In terms of the other uses of גוי in the Chronicler, it would, at first appearance, seem unlikely. However, II Samuel 7:23 (which is almost identical to I Chronicles

---

[1] Psalm 105:6 contains the same phrase but reads "Abraham" instead of "Israel." Since the Hymn of Asaph is composed of excerpts from Psalms 96, 105, and 106, either the Chronicler or a later editor made this substitution when composing the hymn; perhaps this represented an attempt to make I Chronicles 16:13 parallel with I Chronicles 16:17 (where "Jacob" and "Israel" are also mentioned). Interestingly, the Syriac version of I Chronicles 16:13 reads "Abraham" instead of "Israel."

17:21) is translated "What other nation . . ." in the LXX.[1] The use of "other" would seem to lend some credence to considering גוי as a term for the elect in this particular instance. However, even if this is the case, it is important to note that two other specified nominal forms, עם and ישראל, are also present so that גוי becomes at most a highly specialized usage qualified by the presence of the other nominal forms. The noun גוי does not stand alone as an identifying term for the elect. Once again, ethnic considerations provide the basis for inclusion in the elect group. Israel is contrasted with other groups of people.

The nominal form ישראל is, by the very nature of its frequent use, somewhat difficult to analyze in detail, but there are some general trends which are observable. Most of the relevant occurrences in Chronicles give the distinct impression that the elect group Israel is coterminous with the ethnic group--the Israelites (e.g., I Chr. 1:43; 27:1; 28:8; II Chr. 5:10; 6:11; 8:2; 20:7). A good example is found in the distinction drawn by Solomon between the foreigner and God's people Israel.

> Likewise, when a foreigner, who is not of your people Israel, comes from a far country for the sake of your great name, and your mighty hand, and your outstretched arm, when he comes and prays toward this house, hear from heaven your dwelling place, and do according to all for which the foreigner calls to you. . . (II Chr. 6:32-33).

There is no mention of the possibility of joining the elect people although the foreigner is to be shown every courtesy and allowed to participate to some extent in the cultic life of Israel. Some passages in Ezra also allude to this ethnic identification of the elect group, e.g., when one must prove his father's house or his descent in order to belong to Israel (Ezra 2:59), or when Artaxerxes allows any of the people of Israel in his kingdom to return to Jerusalem if such is their desire (Ezra 7:13). Generally, though, the elect group Israel is limited to the returned exiles; in Ezra 6:16, for example, reference is made to the people of Israel as composed of the priests, the Levites, and the rest of the returned exiles. (Admittedly the returned exiles offer a sin-offering for the twelve tribes of Israel, but the context in which this is found scarcely indicates that the exiles were willing to grant elect status to all Israelites irrespective of their religious beliefs.) In the following verses in Ezra, the Passover is kept by the people of Israel who had returned from exile, plus selected others who had embraced the principles of the returned exiles.

---

[1] The LXX reads: Καὶ τίς ὡς ὁ λαός σου Ἰσραὴλ ἔθνος ἄλλο in II Samuel 7:23. The noun ἔθνος is not modified by an adjective in I Chronicles 17:21. The MT reads: ומי כעמך כישראל גוי אחד in both II Samuel 7:23 and I Chronicles 17:21. The usual translation of is ἔθνος in the LXX so this translation in II Samuel is not unusual. See Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (2 vols; Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954), I, 368-72.

> So they killed the passover lamb for all the returned exiles, for their fellow priests, and for themselves; it was eaten by the people of Israel who had returned from exile, and also by every one who had joined them and separated himself from the pollutions of the peoples of the land to worship the Lord, the God of Israel (Ezra 6:20-21).

Even though others (primarily Judeans) were permitted to join the Passover, it is rather striking that only to the returned exiles is the appellation ישראל applied. The members of ישראל in Nehemiah are generally defined in ethnic terms. Nehemiah prays to God for the people of Israel (meaning those in Judah who escaped exile) (Neh. 1:6). Reference to the same group is made in 2:10, except they are called the "children of Israel." In Nehemiah 9:2 and 13:2, ישראל is the elect group, the members of which must be separated from all of foreign descent. However, in Nehemiah 8:17, it is the returned exiles who are portrayed as the people of Israel. "And all the assembly of those who had returned from the captivity made booths and dwelt in the booths; for from the days of Jeshua the son of Nun to that day the people of Israel had not done so." It is the returned exiles who are fulfilling correctly the obligations laid on the people of Israel by God (through his intermediary, Moses). The implication is very clear; by responding to the commandments of God, only the returned exiles are truly the elect group.

Several of the passages containing עבד also spell out quite clearly that it is the people Israel who are God's עבדים (cf. Neh. 1:10; I Chr. 16:13; II Chr. 6:27). Other passages are not so explicit, but the various contexts suggest very strongly that it is the people Israel who are identified as the servants of God; a good example is II Chronicles 6:14: "O Lord, God of Israel, there is no God like you, in heaven or on earth, keeping covenant and showing steadfast love to your servants who walk before you with all their heart. . . ." The composition of the elect, the עבדים of God, is narrowed somewhat in Nehemiah 2:20. Nehemiah informs Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem that they are not considered part of the elect. Only God's servants are permitted to rebuild the wall of Jerusalem.[1] Although it is not so stated explicitly, the elect group in this reference would seem to be composed of Judeans only, those who had particular loyalty to Jerusalem. (See Nehemiah 1:2-3 where Nehemiah asks about the welfare of those survivors left in Judah.) Thus, Nehemiah says to the enemies of the servants, ". . . you have no portion or right or memorial in Jerusalem" (Neh. 2:20).

---

[1] This represents an attempt to define election on grounds other than ethnicity. Sanballat and Tobiah were both Yahweh worshippers. Sanballat was descended from Israelites although he was not Judean. See Rowley, "Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple," BJRL, XXXVIII (1955-56), 166-68.

Only once does עדה appear in the Chronicler. Solomon, along with all the congregation of Israel, worships before the Lord; evidently, this עדה was limited to male Israelites only.

> And the men of Israel assembled before the king at the feast which is in the seventh month. . . . And King Solomon and all the congregation of Israel, who had assembled before him, were before the ark, sacrificing so many sheep and oxen that they could not be counted or numbered (II Chr. 5:3, 6).

There is no question but what membership in this group was ethnically derived. Unfortunately, no critical analysis of the composition of the עדה can be made on the basis of only one example.

The nominal form עם is often used to indicate the possessive relationship of God toward the chosen people, e.g., "his people" (II Chr. 36:16, 23; Ezra 1:3), "your people" (I Chr. 29:18; II Chr. 6:21; 20:7; Neh. 1:10), or "my people, Israel" (I Chr. 11:2; 17:7; II Chr. 6:5, 6), "his people, Israel" (I Chr. 14:2; 21:3; 23:25). With but one exception, nowhere does עם indicate any more precisely than the term ישראל (which is an ethnic term in the passages cited from Chronicles) just who comprises the elect group. The one exception is Ezra 4:4 where the עם יהודה (evidently comprising only the returned exiles--cf. Ezra 4:1) is contrasted with the people of the land (those who may happen to worship Yahweh but are not to be considered members of the elect group).

> Then the people of the land discouraged the people of Judah, and made them afraid to build, and hired counselors against them to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus King of Persia, even until the reign of Darius King of Persia (Ezra 4:4-5).

Not only is there an ethnic consideration present here (since the "people of the land" were descendants of settlers brought in by Esarhaddon--cf. Ezra 4:2), but the further consideration of special experience (the exile) is also present as a necessary prerequisite for membership in the elect group. No mention is made of the election status of those who did not participate in the exile and yet were Israelite by lineage. Presumably, from the standpoint of the writer of Ezra, they, too, would be excluded from participating in the rebuilding of the temple (a task reserved for the elect of God).

The remnant (פליכה) is described in Ezra 9:8 in the same sense as it is found in Isaiah 1-39. By the grace of God, a small portion of God's elect have been allowed to survive.

> But now for a brief moment favor has been shown by the Lord our God, to leave us a remnant, and to give us a secure hold within his holy place, that our God may brighten our eyes and grant us a little reviving in our bondage (Ezra 9:8).

The context in which this reference occurs makes it very clear that the remnant, the elect, is the group of returned exiles. No mention is made of Israelites who did not participate in the exiles' experience. In Nehemiah, however, the term פליכה is applied to those Jews in Judah who had not gone into exile. ". . . Hanani, one of my brethren, came with certain men out of Judah; and I asked them concerning the Jews that survived, who had escaped exile, and concerning Jerusalem" (Neh. 1:2). This is a striking difference in the use of the term compared to that found in Ezra. In Chronicles, the term is applied to those Israelites in Northern Israel who escaped exile at the hands of the Assyrians. They are invited to join with the people of Judah and thereby "return to the Lord," but they are treated as equal members of the elect group. "O people of Israel, return to the Lord, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, that he may turn again to the remnant of you who have escaped from the hand of the kings of Assyria" (II Chr. 20:6). The use of פליכה , then, is mixed in terms of determining just who is considered elect. Either the returned exiles, the Judeans, or even the Northern Israelites are considered as elect. Once again, Ezra is consistent in defining the elect group primarily in terms of those who participated in a specific experience.

The single appearance of קדוש is worth noting. It is the only example of a specified nominal form which is applied exclusively to the Levites: "And he said to the Levites who taught all Israel and who were holy to the Lord. . ." (II Chr. 35:3). No special elect status is implicit in this statement. However, it is found in a context which emphasizes Israel as the elect group, for in II Chronicles 35:3 it is said, "Now serve the Lord your God and his people Israel."

Although קהל is used in the Chronicler's work to refer exclusively to the elect group, the composition of this group is not always static. References in Ezra are consistent in that all refer exclusively to the returned exiles. In all cases, the קהל includes men, women, and children (Ezra 2:64; 10:1, 8, 12, 14). In Ezra 10:1, theקהל is gathered "from Israel" (מישראל).

> While Ezra prayed and made confession, weeping and casting himself down before the house of God, a very great assembly of men, women, and children, gathered to him out of Israel, for the people wept bitterly (Ezra 10:1).

This seems to be but one more example of the emphasis in Ezra on distinguishing between the elect group and the ethnic entity, Israel. Nehemiah contains several different interpretations of the limits of the קהל. Several times the קהל includes only the returned exiles (Neh. 7:66; 8:17), but on other occasions membership in the elect group is not as limited. In one instance, the law is read (by Ezra the priest) before a קהל comprised of men and women (presumably returned exiles only) and "all who could hear with understanding" (כל מבין לשמע) (Neh. 8:2). This seems to open up the possibility of including in the elect group not only the returned exiles but also those who were sympathetic to the new legal requirements and hence willing to submit to the new religious regime. Usually such persons would be Israelite in background and more likely Judean. Then in Nehemiah 13:1, the קהל האלהים consists of all who are ethnically Israelite. "On that day they read from the book of Moses in the hearing of the people; and in it was found written that no Ammonite or Moabite should ever enter the assembly of God" (Neh. 13:1). Those of foreign descent are to be separated from Israel. The necessity of participating in the exile to belong to the elect group is never implied here. The differences in Nehemiah are most likely due to differences in the sources comprising that book. It will be recalled that Nehemiah 13 is generally considered to be part of the "memoirs" of Nehemiah whereas Nehemiah 7, 8-10 are not.[1] The use of קהל in Chronicles is also mixed. The noun can describe a general war assembly composed of various commanders and leaders (I Chr. 13:2; 28:8; II Chr. 1:3; 23:3). The phrase קהל ישראל is used to describe all the assembled elders of Israel, heads of the tribes, heads of the fathers' houses, all the important males of the people Israel (II Chr. 6:3, 12, 12). The phrase קהל לישראל is applied to all the people of Jerusalem and Judah, all of whom were required to help pay for the restoration of the temple (II Chr. 24:6). II Chronicles 30:25 is a key passage for understanding the meaning of קהל. Hezekiah proclaimed a feast in which the קהל of Judah and the קהל of Northern Israel shared together. In addition, sojourners in both countries were invited, but they are listed as a separate entity totally apart from the קהל.

---

[1] The reader is referred to chapter two, pp.36 ff. for a complete analysis of the sources in Nehemiah.

> The whole assembly of Judah, and the priests and the Levites, and the whole assembly that came out of Israel, and the sojourners who came out of the land of Israel, and the sojourners who dwelt in Judah, rejoiced (II Chr. 30:25).

This passage is interesting in that Israelites from the former northern kingdom are considered a קהל, but there is no attempt to link them with Israelites in the south in one great קהל which would signify the overall unity of the people Israel. One must assume that in this particular case the קהל of Northern Israel comprised the elect in the same sense as did that of Judah, since members of both shared in a cultic feast. Yet this is the only time in Chronicles that קהל status is granted to the Northern Israelites. Otherwise, the membership of the קהל is limited to Judeans only during the period of the divided kingdom. Again, the concept of who is elect is narrower in Ezra than in either Nehemiah or Chronicles. This is particularly true when one limits the comparison in Nehemiah to the "memoirs" portion of that document.

The one relevant occurrence of שאר is found in Nehemiah 10:29. This usage is not a clear-cut example of the "remnant" as, e.g., it is used in Isaiah 1-39; nevertheless, it is in a passage which defines the composition of the elect group. Those who made a covenant together to walk in God's law included the priests, Levites, various temple functionaries, and all the families of those who had separated themselves from the people of the lands; all who had knowledge and understanding were part of the elect. This group is comprised essentially of the returned exiles (plus the few who may have been allowed to join them). The more basic definition of the elect was evident in Nehemiah 8:2, but neither of these references in Nehemiah 8, 10 reflects the understanding of the elect group found in the "memoirs" portion of Nehemiah.

The concept of an escaped remnant is expressed by שארית . Ezra suggests that if the returned exiles should fail to obey the commandments of God, there would be no שארית (Ezra 9:14). The word is used in parallelism with פליטה. The following verse (Ezra 9:15) identifies the returned exiles as an escaped remnant (using the verbal form שאר with פליטה) so there is no question about who would be eligible to be part of the שארית. The interchangeable usage of שארית/שאר and פליטה in these verses is very significant. Both nominal forms are used in the Chronicler to apply to the "returned exiles" as well as to other "remnants." Another reference to the exiles, though not yet the returned exiles, as שארית occurs in the last chapter of II Chronicles. The "remnant" from the sword were taken into exile in Babylon in order to fulfill the plan of God (II Chr. 36:20). This reference defines the שארית in the same manner as the typical definition of the elect group found in Ezra. In II Chronicles 34:9, those in Northern Israel who escaped exile at the hands of the Assyrians are labeled שארית ישראל. However, in this context it seems that only those faithful to the Jerusalem Temple were included as part of this elect group. Josiah was busy raising money to repair and to refurbish the temple and he undoubtedly sent his agents to all areas, north and south, where Israelites lived.[1]

Analysis of the nominal forms shows there are some identifiable motifs in the literature of the Chronicler concerning the identity of the elect group. Ezra is consistent throughout in limiting the elect to the returned exiles. (In analyzing the verb בדל it was suggested that this may well be the case in Ezra.) As has been shown, there are very few exceptions to this rule. Chronicles and Nehemiah, to the contrary, present a view of the elect which is broader in membership than that presented in Ezra. Most of the references in Chronicles equate membership in the elect group with membership in the ethnic unit, the Israelites. Relevant occurrences in Nehamiah (with the exception of Nehemiah 7-10) also suggest ethnicity as the primary basis for inclusion in the elect group.[1] The definition of the elect group in Nehemiah 7-10 is much closer to that found in Ezra than to that presented in the remainder of Nehemiah. The motif suggested here is that Ezra contains the narrowest definition of the elect group. Ezra's concept is based on a combination of ethnicity and an unique experience (the exile) which transcends previous experience hitherto available to all ethnic Israelites. This definition is also presented in Nehemiah 7-10. It is worth noting that the difference between Nehemiah and Ezra is an excellent example of the integrity with which the Chronicler used his sources. No attempt was made by him and subsequent editors to mold these two documents into a consistent, unified theological-historical work. The differences were allowed to stand; each source was allowed to be its own advocate.

---

[1] Bright, History, pp. 297-300, suggests that the reaffirmation of Jerusalem and the Temple as central to all "true" Israelites was part of Josiah's nationalistic-religious expansion program. Obviously, the aims of this program would be enhanced by a careful definition of the elect group. Not all Northern Israelites were favorable to Josiah's reforms. Hence, the "remnant" becomes a rather select group.

Another clear motif present in the nominal forms is the concentration throughout on the election of the entire people (both laity and clergy). It is also apparent that men, women, and children share in the elect status. No attempt is made to single out any element within the elect people for special elect status. (Of course, there are differences in defining just who the whole elect people are.)

---

[1] It is quite likely that the Israelites which the author of Nehemiah had in mind were Judeans only. Certainly this is the intent of passages such as Nehemiah 1:2. However, this type of discernment is not present throughout Nehemiah so that a general statement could be made to this effect.

Finally, the principle of separation of the elect from the non-elect (presented so forcefully through the verbal form בדל) is reaffirmed throughout the Chronicler's work--even in Chronicles (e.g., II Chr. 30:6). The definition of the membership of the elect group may differ, but the idea of separating that group from the non-elect is prevalent throughout the Chronicler's work.

The nominal forms are much more helpful than the verbal forms in discovering who was considered to be elect. The few verbal occurrences are insufficient to define precisely the composition of the elect group. With the exception of בדל, there is no indication among the verbal forms that the elect group is anything less than an entire ethnic unit, the Israelites. Analysis of the nominal forms corrects this imbalanced picture and shows more clearly the variety of understandings about the composition of the elect group present in the Chronicler's work. In response to the question of who is elect, answers vary on a spectrum ranging from only those who participated in the exile to those who are ethnically Israelites. Membership in the elect does not extend beyond the ethnic boundary. Having suggested who is considered elect, the question of who is excluded from the elect becomes a natural subsequent consideration.

Who is Excluded from Being Elect?

Of the verbal forms, only בדל is helpful in answering this question.

All occurrences of this verb affirm, in no uncertain terms, that the elect and non-elect groups are to be separated. (The only exception to this use of בדל is found in I Chronicles 23:13 and 25:1; in both cases, the clergy are separated from the rest of the people in order to perform a specific function.) In most cases, the membership of both the elect and the non-elect are specified. The latter category includes: those of foreign descent (non-Israelites) (Neh. 9:2; 13:3; Ezra 10:11); those who follow heathen customs (Ezra 6:21; 9:1); or those who do not adhere to the law of God (Neh. 10:29). Typical examples are: "And the Israelites separated themselves from all foreigners, and stood and confessed their sins and the iniquities of their fathers" (Neh. 9:2).

> After these things had been done, the officials approached me and said, 'The people of Israel and the priests and the Levites have not separated themselves from the peoples of the lands with their abominations. . .' (Ezra 9:1).

> The rest of the people, the priests, the Levites, the gatekeepers, the singers, the temple servants, and all who have separated themselves from the peoples of the lands to the law of God, their wives, their sons, their daughters, all who have knowledge and understanding, join with their brethren, their nobles, and enter into a curse and an oath to walk in God's law which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord our Lord and his ordinances and his statutes (Neh. 10:29-30).

The first group represents exclusion from the elect group based on ethnic considerations only. The other two groups are certainly based, at the minimum, on ethnic considerations (since it was assumed that non-Israelites inherently practiced heathen customs), but there is also implicit the possibility that Israelites, too, could be included in these non-elect groups. The tentative nature of such a conclusion must be emphasized, however, for these passages do not explicitly state that certain Israelites are excluded from the elect group.

The only relevant nominal forms describing the non-elect group are גוי and עם . The "nations" (גוים) are said to be the enemies of the elect group (Neh. 5:9). In Nehemiah 5:17, the גוים are described as non-Jews. "Moreover, there were at my table a hundred and fifty men, Jews and officials, besides those who came to us from the nations which were about us" (Neh. 5:17). However, this particular reference to the non-elect is not in any way derogatory. Members of the גוים are permitted to eat at Nehemiah's table along with the Jews. Still, there is no suggestion that ethnic differences were overlooked. The distinction between Jew and non-Jew, elect and non-elect is still quite apparent. The only relevant occurrence in Ezra describes members of the גוי הארץ as those who practice customs totally unacceptable to the God of Israel (Ezra 6:21). The context makes it quite likely that recalcitrant Israelites (probably Judeans) were included in this non-elect group along with non-Israelites. Only those who separated from the "pollutions" of the גוים to join the exiles were allowed to celebrate the Passover. In Chronicles, the גוים are presented in various contexts (not all derogatory) which emphasize their distinctiveness (ethnically speaking) from the Israelites. The Levites are instructed to pray that the elect group be gathered and saved by God from among the גוים (I Chr. 16:35). The Israelites are to declare God's glory among the גוים (I Chr. 16:24). In other passages, members of the גוים are excluded from the elect group not only because of birth but also because of their pagan customs (II Chr. 28:3; 33:2, 9). All three passages list a heinous offense followed by the assertion that the גוים are those non-Israelites whom the Lord drove out before the people of Israel. The Chronicler gives the distinct impression that he expects the גוים to practice idolatry and child sacrifice because it is the nature of the non-elect to do so. They become the standard against which the chosen people are measured. Thus, Manasseh leads the people of Judah and Jerusalem to commit more evil than even the גוים whom the Lord had destroyed before the people of Israel (II Chr. 33:9). Generally, the references in Chronicles and Nehemiah merely define the non-elect as non-Israelites. Only the reference in Ezra suggests that some Israelites, as well as non-Israelites, were members of the non-elect group.

The noun עם is used to describe the non-elect most frequently in the phrase עמי הארצות , "peoples of the lands." In its various contexts, this phrase is always distinguished from the elect group (which is usually portrayed as an ethnic unit, the Israelites). References to the "peoples of the lands" can be derogatory.

> For we have forsaken your commandments which you did command by your servants the prophets, saying, 'The land which you are entering to take possession of it, is a land unclean with the pollutions of the peoples of the lands, with their abominations which have filled it from end to end with their uncleanness . . .' (Ezra 9:10-11).

This non-elect group is, on occasion, portrayed as the enemy of the people of Israel (Neh. 9:24, 30). Above all, intermarriage with these non-Israelites is not to be permitted (Neh. 10:30). In Nehemiah 10:28, it is possible that certain unrepentant Israelites (i.e., those who do not agree to follow the law as interpreted by the returned exiles) are included with the "peoples of the lands" as part of the non-elect. The verse refers to the elect as "all who have separated themselves from the peoples of the lands to the law of God. . ." (The phraseology is very similar to that of Ezra 6:26.) This would allow for the possibility that ethnic background was not the only criterion for describing the non-elect.

Disavowal of the law as interpreted by the returned exiles might also be a reason for exclusion from the elect group. At one point the text is quite specific about the composition of the non-elect (i.e., the "peoples of the lands"). These include the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Amorites (Ezra 9:1). Since most of these groups had long since disappeared or been assimilated in the post-exilic period, this reference in Ezra becomes merely a strong reminder that the composition of the non-elect group has not changed since the people of Israel first entered the land. All who are not Israelite are therefore to be considered part of the non-elect group. In opposition to this non-elect group, the elect group is described as the "holy race" which is not to be mixed with these non-elect people (Ezra 9:2). In Chronicles, too, the "peoples of the lands" are described as the non-elect (i.e., non-Israelites). Their gods are false, and therefore their practices are to be avoided by the Israelites (I Chr. 5:25; II Chr. 13:9; 32:19). "Have you not driven out the priests of the Lord, the sons of Aaron, and the Levites, and made priests for yourselves like the peoples of other lands?" (II Chr. 13:9). Most other references to the non-elect group use the plural form עמים without any further description as part of the title. References of this type are not necessarily derogatory, but they draw a definite distinction between the non-elect (non-Israelites) and the elect group (e.g., I Chr. 16:8, 24, 26, 28; Neh. 1:8). Indeed, these particular references in Chronicles (all of which occur in Asaph's hymn of thanksgiving) are decidedly universalistic although there is no specific mention of a change in the state of the non-elect because of any proclamation made by the elect. All references in Ezra using עם by itself refer only to the elect group. References to the non-elect combine עם with other words as part of the title. Further, all of the references in Ezra which designate the non-elect are found in contexts which contain the explicit or implicit demand that the elect separate from the non-elect.

In the majority of cases, the definition of the non-elect group is rather explicit; it is comprised of non-Israelites. In one reference (Ezra 9:1), the identity of these peoples is even enumerated for emphasis. There is, then, at the very minimum, an ethnic division between the elect and the non-elect. There is a further description of the non-elect; it is the group which practices the abominable customs of child sacrifice and worship of false gods. The tacit assumption in most cases is that those who are non-Israelites and those who follow such abominable customs are one and the same group. There is never any question that non-Israelites are excluded from the elect group. There does seem to be a reluctance to relegate Israelites to the non-elect group. Further, the practices of the elect and non-elect groups are described, and the reader can draw his own conclusions about the status of those Israelites who may have continued to practice heathen customs. In several passages it is implied that non-repentant Israelites are excluded from the elect group (e.g., Ezra 6:21; Neh. 10:28), but this exclusion is never articulated precisely. In these cases, the non-repentant Israelites seem to be in limbo, not included with the elect and not identified as part of the non-elect. It seems likely that the various writers were not prepared to eliminate the possibility that these Israelites would repent; affirm the principles and practices of the elect group; and be counted as full members of the elect group.

In conclusion, it can be said that non-Israelites were excluded from the elect group. All Israelites had the possibility of being included in the elect group, but evidently not all Israelites were actually considered to be part of the elect group.

How Does One Become Elect?

The most obvious way to become elect was to be born to parents who were already members of the elect group. Throughout the Chronicler's work (but especially in Chronicles and the "memoirs" of Nehemiah) emphasis is placed on the elect status as hereditary. The Israelites are elect because they are Israelites. Conversely, non-Israelites are not elect because of their birth. Beyond this basic requirement of ethnicity, the book of Ezra, as well as Nehemiah 7-10, emphasizes a further requirement to become a member of the elect. Adherence to specific laws and practices (which include separation from "heathen customs") is required of members of the elect group. Knowledge of these laws and practices was essentially limited to those who had returned from exile. (One might say, with a great deal of veracity, that for the authors of Ezra and Nehemiah 7-10 the elect status was merely synonymous with being a returned exile.) Israelites who were non-exiles had to affirm the principles laid down by the exiles in order to participate in the elect status (cf. Ezra 6:21; Neh. 8:2; 10:28). Ethnic background alone was not determinative of elect status. This view represents a departure from the ethnicity requirement presented in Chronicles and the "memoirs" of Nehemiah.[1] However, whether emphasizing birth only, or birth and a specific affirmation, as a prerequisite for being elect, all portions of the Chronicler's composition attest to the belief that it is not possible for a non-Israelite to become part of the elect group.

---

[1] Nehemiah 2:20 is an exception to this general statement. Nehemiah speaks to Sanballat and Tobiah: "The God of heaven will make us prosper, and we his servants will arise and build; but you have no portion or right or memorial in Jerusalem."

Through Whom are the Promises of Election Traced?

This question is designed to determine what persons, as well as what events of the past, are appropriated to corroborate the elect status in the present.

Promises made to the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (or Israel) are often cited as the foundation upon which the present elect group rests. God's friendship for the patriarchs is seen to continue in his concern for their descendants. In the Hymn of Asaph, the Israelites are called the offspring of Abraham and the [illegible]ns of Jacob (I Chr. 16:13). The hymn continues by referring to an eternal covenant which was made to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Israel, a covenant which promised the land of Canaan to their descendants (I Chr. 16:16-18). In another context, David prays to the Lord, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel in the same sentence in which he asks that God always keep his people (Israel) mindful of his blessing (I Chr. 29:18). In II Chronicles 20:7, the gift of land for the people Israel is given "forever" to the descendants of Abraham, friend of God. In still another passage, Hezekiah sends word to the people of Northern Israel to return to the Lord, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, so that God can turn again to the remnant which escaped exile in Assyria (II Chr. 30:6). The theme of land for the elect is reiterated in Nehemiah 9:7-8 where God's choice of Abraham and, through him, his descendants, is the justification for the present land tenure.

> You are the Lord, the God who chose Abram and brought him forth out of Ur of the Chaldees and gave him the name Abraham; and you did find his heart faithful before you, and did make with him the covenant to give to his descendants the land. . . .

All of the references to the patriarchs attest to an ethnic understanding of the elect. Abraham, as the patriarch par excellence,[7] is the first father of the people Israel. As such, he is mentioned in all references. He becomes the progenitor of election promises, especially the promise of land (which is to be understood as a symbol of continued election). Through him, all Israelites share in the original act of election. Referring to Isaac and Jacob (or Israel) serves to intensify this sense of ethnic unity which identifies the elect people. With the possible exception of II Chronicles 30:6 (which is an appeal to recognize the primacy of Jerusalem and the Temple), there is no reference to the obligations laid on the elect. Only the promises of election are emphasized. In this regard, it is significant that the book of Ezra contains no reference to the ethnic unity of the elect people as derived through the patriarchs. This omission is in keeping with the general tenor of Ezra with its more exclusionistic understanding of the elect group. It is also noteworthy that Nehemiah 9 contains a reference to the ethnic unity in Abraham. This represents a divergence from the typical pattern of general agreement between Ezra and Nehemiah 7-10 regarding election.

Another one of the sources of election is found in references to the "fathers." Some of the returned exiles, seeking to prove thier priestly lineage, were excluded (from the priesthood) because they did not know their fathers' houses or their descent, whether they belonged to Israel (Ezra 2:59). Admittedly, this reference does not specify that these individuals were excluded from the elect group; nevertheless, it emphasizes the significance of ethnic identification and the role played by ancestors in seeking to justify one's position in the elect group. Another pertinent reference in Ezra emphasizes the great guilt of the people (in yielding to the abominations of the heathen) from the days of the fathers to the present day (Ezra 9:7). This represents a reversal of the usual approach to election. The fathers are seen as the source of the iniquities which have been passed down from generation to generation. Yet, despite the long record of wickedness, God is still faithful to his people; he has preserved a remnant. In essence, the election promises made to the fathers are still being realized in the remnant. Identification of the present elect group with the fathers is a basic element of David's speech to the assembled leaders of Israel (I Chr. 29:10 ff.). The present group is said to be strangers and sojourners before God as were the fathers. Yet, God continues to provide blessings to his elect. David then continues by referring to the Lord, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel. The three patriarchs are called "our fathers." The fathers are also recalled as the recipients of election through the events of the Exodus. "And you did see the affliction of our fathers in Egypt and hear their cry at the Red Sea, and did perform signs and wonders against Pharaoh and all his servants and all the people of his land" (Neh. 9:9-10). The redemption from Egypt is combined with the conquest as a sign of Israel's elect status in I Chronicles 17:21. Although the fathers are not mentioned by name, it is obvious that they were the original inheritors of election with whom the present elect group is identifying. In all of these passages, then, the present elect group is portrayed as ethnically united with the fathers. The same emphasis is present in Ezra 9:7 although the ethnic unity attests to the continuity of guilt as well as to God's continual steadfast love in spite of iniquity.

> From the days of our fathers to this day we have been in great guilt; and for our iniquities we, our kings, and our priests have been given into the hand of the kings of the lands, to the sword, to captivity, to plundering, and to utter shame, as at this day (Ezra 9:7).

The role of Moses, as law giver, is stressed as a witness to the elect group. Moses is regarded as the mediator of the commandments of God which must be obeyed in order for the elect group to continue to receive the blessings of election.

> Remember the word which you commanded your servant Moses saying, 'If you are unfaithful, I will scatter you among the peoples; but if you return to me and keep my commandments and do them, though your dispersed be under the farthest skies, I will gather them and bring them to the place which I have chosen, to make my name dwell there' (Neh. 1:8-9).

The same type of emphasis, again with Moses as mediator, is found in a passage which is preceded immediately by an affirmation of the election of the people of Israel through the event of the Exodus (Neh. 9:14). Ezra is said to be skilled in the law of Moses which the Lord the God of Israel had given. ". . . this Ezra went up from Babylonia. He was a scribe skilled in the law of Moses which the Lord the God of Israel had given. . ." (Ezra 7:6). Nothing is said of Moses' role in solidifying the elect status of the people. In Chronicles, two references are pertinent. David tells Solomon that he will be prosperous and the elect people will prosper as well if he obeys the laws God commanded Moses for Israel (I Chr. 22:13). The other passage mentions the tables of the law which Moses put in the ark at Horeb when God made a covenant with the people of Israel (II Chr. 5:10). Although no further amplification is given, the implication is clear.

Obedience to the law of Moses is an essential aspect of being elect.

Finally, David (along with some of the members of the davidic dynasty) is portrayed as guarantor of the elect status of the people Israel. The classic text is I Chronicles 17:7, in which David is chosen to rule over God's people Israel. "Now therefore thus shall you say to my servant David, 'Thus says the Lord of hosts, I took you from the pasture, from following the sheep, that you should be prince over my people Israel. . . .'" Through David and his descendants, peace will be guaranteed to the elect people; God's kingdom and the davidic throne will be established forever (I Chr. 17:8-14). The implication of these promises is very clear. As long as a davidic ruler is on the throne, the status of the elect people will be preserved. Solomon serves to reiterate the promises made to David. He prays that he, too, will be the recipient of God's favor in order to rule wisely over God's people (II Chr. 1:8-10). At another point Solomon is told by David that peace and blessing will accrue to the people of Israel if only he obeys the laws given by God to Moses (I Chr. 22:12-13). In yet another passage, Solomon recounts the promise made to David to rule over the chosen people and then demonstrates how he (Solomon) is the direct benefactor of that promise (II Chr. 6:5 ff.). Thus, while the source of the elect status of the people Israel is not traced directly through David and his heirs, the welfare of the elect people is, nevertheless, traced back to David and his house. In a word, the monarch is to be a visible symbol of God's continual concern for the elect people. This view is only presented in Chronicles, however. The post-exilic period as presented in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah does not emphasize this idea as a basis for understanding the elect. Ezra 8:20 contains the only reference to David outside of Chronicles, and it merely mentions the fact that David and his officials set aside certain temple servants to assist the Levites.

In a variety of persons through whom the promises of election are traced, there are several themes which are worth mentioning. In the book of Ezra, the promises of election are traced only through the fathers. The patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are not mentioned at all in Ezra. Moses and David appear only briefly, the former in several insignificant references to the "law of Moses" and the latter in a reference to the status of the Levites. The book of Nehemiah, to the contrary, does not contain references to the fathers as sources of election; rather, the role of specific patriarchs, as well as Moses, is emphasized. The divergence of Nehemiah 9 from the emphasis found in Ezra represents a departure from the norm noted in the preceding section. The role of the davidic dynasty, ignored in both Ezra and Nehemiah, is very evident in Chronicles. This is appropriate since only Chronicles records the pre-exilic period during which the davidic dynasty was operative. It is also evident that the Chronicler himself was interested in David because of his alleged association with the levitical office along with its special prerogatives. A major feature of all the references cited is the emphasis on ethnic continuity. Be it patriarchs, fathers, Moses, or David, the emphasis is on the people Israel as the direct beneficiaries of the election promises made to the forebears. Regardless of the precise composition of the present elect group, in all cases the elect status of ancestors is appropriated as a direct continuous link between past and present.

By What Basic Concept is the Belief in Election Expressed?

The primary institution through which the fact of election is articulated is the covenant (ברית). There are a number of pertinent references in the Chronicler's work in which election and covenant are attested in the same passage. Most are found in Chronicles; the majority of these involve the king in one way or another.[1] Solomon refers to the Temple he built in which rests the covenant the Lord made with the people of Israel (II Chr. 6:11). This covenant, in its sacred place, serves as a visible reminder to the people of their elect status and the obligations which this entails. A more active role regarding the covenant is played by Asa, King of Judah. He gathers together all Judah and Benjamin, plus those from Northern Israel who are so minded, and they enter into a covenant to seek the Lord in all earnestness (II Chr. 15:9-12). Thus, what amounts to the elect group takes up specific obligations as the appropriate response to its elect status. Much the same type of covenant is made by both Jehoida and Hezekiah in order to guarantee the Lord's favor. "And Jehoiada made a covenant between himself and all the people and the king that they should be the Lord's people" (II Chr. 23:16). Hezekiah states: "Now it is in my heart to make a covenant with the Lord, the God of Israel, that his fierce anger may turn away from us" (II Chr. 29:10). The only difference between the two is that Jehoida covenants with the people that together they should be the Lord's people, whereas Hezekiah covenants with the Lord on behalf of the chosen people. In both cases, the covenant is the required response to an election which involves a specific obligation, the purification of the cult so that the elect may once again receive God's blessing. Josiah, too, requires the elect people to join him in a covenant to keep God's covenant and to obey all the laws and statutes (II Chr. 34:29-32). Again, the elect are admonished to live up to their responsibilities as the people of God. Two other references in Chronicles link election and covenant without mentioning a king. The Hymn of Asaph provides the setting for reminding the Israelites (who are called God's chosen ones) of God's eternal covenant which, though first made with the patriarchs, is still operative in the present (I Chr. 16:13-18). This covenant reference does not emphasize any obligations on the part of the chosen people. Only God's obligation to give the land of Canaan is stated.[1] The other reference in Chronicles is to the two tablets which were placed in the ark by Moses; these are the symbols of the covenant the Lord made with the people of Israel when they came out of Egypt. "There was nothing in the ark except the two tables which Moses put there at Horeb, where the Lord made a covenant with the people of Israel, when they came out of Egypt" (II Chr. 5:10). This verse represents a classic wedding of election and covenant. The act of redemption from Egypt is the election of the people Israel par excellence. The Chronicler (who follows the Deuteronomist faithfully at this point--cf. I Kings 8:9) has the people enter into a covenant with God as a legitimate expression of the fact of election. The presence of Moses as covenant mediator indicates that there were covenant obligations incumbent on all members of the elect group. In the book of Ezra, all the people made a covenant with God to separate themselves from foreign wives and any children of these wives. Ezra himself serves as covenant mediator.

---

[1] This function of the king as covenant maker is to be regarded as different from the role of the king as a source of election promises. The latter was treated in the preceding section.

---

[1] This is typical of the Abrahamic covenant as opposed to the Mosaic covenant. The latter always contains obligations placed on the people rather than those placed on God. See Mendenhall, "Covenant," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, I, 717-19.

> Therefore let us make a covenant with our God to put away all these wives and their children, according to the counsel of my lord and of those who tremble at the commandment of our God; and let it be done according to the law (Ezra 10:3).

This act of covenant-making is preceded by a confession of guilt coupled with an affirmation of hope for the elect people if they respond correctly. (It is the returned exiles who comprise the elect in this passage.) Contrariwise, he gives the distinct impression that if the covenant had not been enacted, the elect status may well have been in jeopardy. This emphasis on separation, as enacted through the covenant, is typical of the understanding of election in Ezra. The speech of Ezra in Nehemiah 9 and 10 twice provides the setting for the expression of election through the covenant. As part of a summary of the history of the elect people, Ezra refers to the election of Abraham which was confirmed by a covenant granting to his descendants the promised land (Neh. 9:7-8). Typically, there is no mention of any obligation laid on the elect people in the Abrahamic covenant. However, Ezra continues by telling of the act of election in the exodus which was followed by the giving of the law to Moses at Mt. Sinai.[1] In response to these various acts of election, all those who have separated from heathen customs enter into a covenant to keep the laws and statutes of God as given by Moses (Neh. 10:28-29). Thus, the typical pattern of linking the name of Moses to specific requirements for the elect is continued. The presence of both the Abrahamic covenant and the Mosaic covenant in the same context represents a unification of two traditions--that which binds deity with that which binds the elect people. Finally, in Nehemiah 13:25, the elect group is required by Nehemiah to take an oath (the equivalent of entering into a covenant) not to allow their sons or daughters or themselves to marry non-Jews. Once again, being considered part of the elect group requires a specific covenantal response.

---

[1] The use of the term "Sinai" for the sacred mountain is typical of priestly literature. "Horeb" is typical of the deuteronomic literature, and, as such, is used by the Chronicler--cf. II Chronicles 5:10.

In all the examples cited, regardless of the precise composition of the elect group, enactment of the covenant serves as a sign pointing to the elect status. However, beyond this symbolic meaning, the covenant is the specific way in which the elect people are reminded of their obligations as a people chosen by God. Only the two references to the Abrahamic covenant (I Chr. 16:13-18 and Neh. 9:7-8) do not mention any obligations required of the elect people; even the latter is qualified by the inclusion of the law of Moses in the same context. The basic requirement present in all the covenants (whenever any obligations are specified) is for the chosen people to purify themselves (whether this entails separation from the non-elect or a reinstitution of correct cultic worship) both as a witness to the elect status and as a means of guaranteeing it.

Fate of the Elect and the Non-Elect

There are few references in the Chronicler's work to the ultimate fate of either the elect or the non-elect. With respect to the former, one could certainly say there is present a tacit assumption that the elect will continue to survive in the future (much as they have from the time of the patriarchs or the fathers to the present) if they are responsive to the will of God as evidenced through the laws and statutes of Moses. Yet, this tacit assumption is articulated in relatively few instances. The covenant promise of the land of Canaan to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is described in I Chronicles 16:16-18 as an "everlasting covenant" (ברית עולם). In its context, this promise can be interpreted as a guarantee that descendants of the patriarchs, i.e., the elect group (not necessarily all descendants), will continue to live in the land *ad infinitum*. A conditional promise of perpetuity in the promised land is given to the Israelites in II Chronicles 33:8. The only proviso is that the elect obey all the laws and statutes which have been commanded through Moses. In the same passage, God promises that he will place his name in the Temple and in Jerusalem forever (II Chr. 33:7). This promise is a further guarantee that those who maintain proper allegiance to the Temple and Jerusalem will continue to be elect. (It is also an attempt to squelch any claim to elect status by those in Northern Israel who ignore the Jerusalem cult.) Another perspective on the future of the elect is suggested in the petition found in the Hymn of Asaph: "Deliver us, O God of our salvation, and gather and save us from among the nations . . ." (I Chr. 16:35). This expresses the hope that all the elect will be preserved in the future. The phrase "from among the nations" suggests that it is an ethnic entity which is here envisioned as the future elect. (Perhaps the Chronicler was thinking of the Babylonian exiles who had never returned to Judah.) The overall picture of the future of the elect is one of optimism provided the elect conform to the will of God as manifested in specific laws and commandments. There is considerably less emphasis on the elect in the future than on the elect in the present.

Continuity of the elect is assumed provided the exigencies of the present are met.

There is no real concern for the fate of the non-elect. In fact, the general tenor throughout the Chronicler's work is to separate from the non-elect and then to ignore them. There is an occasional exception, of course, e.g., Solomon's concern for the foreigner (non-Israelite and non-elect) who comes to pray at the temple (II Chr. 6:32-33). Overall, however, concern for the non-elect is not in evidence. This means that the fate of the non-elect must be surmised from the various contexts in which one finds the practices of the elect and the non-elect discussed. It seems to this writer that the descriptions of the customs and practices of the non-elect indicate that, from the perspective of the biblical writers, the non-elect are doomed to eventual oblivion. The elect are continually reminded that they must separate from the practices of the non-elect and even from the non-elect themselves. Only through such separation can the elect return to a right relationship with God and thus be saved. In the face of such assertions, it is doubtful that the non-elect could ever have an opportunity for ultimate salvation. What has been said would seem to apply irrevocably to all non-Israelites; but it may well be said that the same lack of salvation also applies to Israelites who are not considered part of the elect group, i.e., those who do not conform to the expectations of the elect group as reported by the various writers in the Chronicler's work. Nehemiah's attitude toward Sanballat and Tobiah is most instructive.

> Hear, O our God, for we are despised; turn back their taunt upon their own heads, and give them up to be plundered in a land where they are captives. Do not cover their guilt, and let not their

> sin be blotted out from your sight; for they have provoked you to anger before the builders (Neh. 4:4-5).

At another point, Nehemiah laments that the descendants of the high priest Eliashib are related by marriage to Sanballat. He asks that God "remember" them because they have defiled the priesthood (Neh. 13:28-29). The implication of this petition is quite clear. Those who have opposed the practices of the elect group, as represented by Nehemiah and his followers, are to be cut off from the blessings of God. In short, their behavior warrants exclusion from the elect group. Apart from these references to the fate of the non-elect, however, the future of this group is ignored.

In essence, the various portions of the Chronicler's work reflect a concern primarily for the present; the past is appropriated where necessary to bolster the claims made by the elect; the future is left to take care of itself but with the tacit assumption that all will go well with the elect if they conform to the required norm. The non-elect are generally ignored; the major emphasis is on the preservation of the elect.

CHAPTER V

THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Occurrences of Election Vocabulary[1]

The Dead Sea Scrolls contain 1008 occurrences of the vocabulary specified in chapter three of which there are 313 verbal forms and 695 nominal forms. Of these totals, the relevant occurrences (i.e., usages expressing the doctrine of election) are 89 and 483, respectively, for the verbal and nominal forms. Of the relevant nominal occurrences, 375 refer to the elect group whereas 108 refer to the non-elect. Out of a total of approximately 22,800 vocabulary occurrences in the Qumran documents specified on p. 3, there are 572 relevant occurrences of election vocabulary. Thus, approximately 2.5% of all vocabulary occurrences are relevant to the doctrine of election.

All of the specified verbs appear at least once in the Dead Sea Scrolls. However, the verbs ברר , גאל , לקח , and קנה are not used to express the doctrine of election. There are 8 occurrences of ברר , but all the references are to various actions taken by humans. The only occurrence of גאל refers to the duties of a goel. The 20 occurrences of לקח generally refer to the taking of wives. The only appearance of קנה refers to human ownership of possessions. The honors for most relevant appearances must be split between בחר (with 19 out of 33 total appearances);

---

[1] See Tables 3, 4, and 5 in the Appendix.

בדל (18 out of 27--all Hiphil); ידע (16 out of 118); and חזק (14 of 55). Not far behind are אהב (10 out of 23) and קרא (9 out of 20). A distant last is פדה with 3 relevant occurrences out of a total of 7 appearances.

The distribution of relevant verbal usages among the major documents (i.e., 1QpHab, 1QS, 1QM, 1QH, CD, and 4QDibHam) is worth noting. There are only 2 relevant verbal occurrences (both ידע) in 1QpHab, but the corresponding numbers for 1QS, 1QM, 1QH, CD, and 4QDibHam are 25, 8, 26, 16, and 6, respectively. However, the ratio of relevant verbal occurrences to total vocabulary occurrences is highest in 4QDibHam (1.1%), followed by 1QS (.65%), 1QH (.47%), CD (.45%), 1QM (.21%), and 1QpHab (.19%). Together, the major documents account for 83 out of the 89 relevant verbal occurrences in the Qumran scrolls. The only conspicuous clusters of a particular verb in a specific document are the 15 appearances of בדל in 1QS (out of a total of only 18 relevant occurrences in all the scrolls) and the 3 appearances of פדה in 1QH (the only times this verb has relevant usages in the scrolls). No single verb has relevant occurrences in all the major documents. The most wide-spread in usage are בחר (occurring in 5 of the 6 major documents plus 2 other documents), and חזק and ידע (each appearing in 4 of the 6 major documents as well as in 1 other document). The best distribution of different relevant verbs in the same document is found in 1QH and CD (each with 6 out of 11 possible relevant verbs), followed by 1QS (5 out of 11), 1QM (4 out of 11), 4QDibHam (3 out of 11), and 1QpHab (1 out of 11).

Only 2 of the specified 17 nominal forms are not used in the Dead Sea Scrolls to express the doctrine of election. There are no appearances of סגלה in the Qumran literature. The noun שאר appears but 3 times, all of which refer to a "remainder" or "portion" of some material substance.

Five nouns account for a significant proportion of the total relevant nominal occurrences (358 out of 483). These include: ישראל (115), יחד (81), עם (56), גוי (54), and עדה (52). The next major grouping of relevant occurrences consists of עבד (22), בחיר (21), סוד (20), קדוש (15), אביון (13), שארית (13), and קהל (12). Completing the relevant occurrences are פליטה, נחלה, and עד with 5, 3, and 1 apiece.

Every single occurrence of בחיר and גוי in the Essene literature is relevant to the doctrine of election. A high proportion of relevant occurrences to total occurrences is found in אביון (13 of 16), יחד (81 of 90), ישראל (115 of 139), קהל (12 of 16), and שארית (13 of 15). Other nominal forms, with a lesser proportion of relevant occurrences, include: נחלה (3 of 14), סוד (20 of 44), עבד (22 of 35), עד (1 of 6), עדה (52 of 83), עם (56 of 111), פליטה (5 of 11), and קדוש (15 of 37).

Eight of the nominal forms are used to refer to the non-elect as well as to the elect. In all 54 of its relevant occurrences גוי is used to describe the non-elect. The noun ישראל is used 12 times (compared with 115 total relevant occurrences) in referring to the non-elect. Completing the list of nouns used to describe the non-elect are: עדה (with 10 out of 52 relevant occurrences applying to the non-elect), עם (8 of 56), סוד (7 of 20), שארית (7 of 13), קהל (6 of 12), and פליטה (4 of 5).

The documents 1QS, 1QM, and CD have about the same number of relevant occurrences for all nominal forms (88, 83, and 87 apiece). Following closely is 1QH with 69 occurrences, and then 4QDibHam (21) and 1QpHab (17). The ratio of relevant nominal occurrences to total vocabulary occurrences (within each document) is highest in 4QDibHam (4%), followed by CD (2.5%), 1QS (2.3%), 1QM (2.2%), 1QpHab (1.7%), and 1QH (1.3%). The remaining relevant occurrences (118) are scattered throughout 23 other documents with no document having more than 12. The total in 1QS is swelled considerably by 57 usages of יחד. (The total number of relevant occurrences of יחד for all the scrolls is only 81.) Overall, of the 17 possible nominal forms, 10 appear in 1QS. The document 1QM is somewhat better balanced than 1QS; its largest totals are 15 relevant occurrences of עם and גוי. Eleven out of 17 possible nominal forms are found in 1QM. The most unusual feature of 1QH is that it contains 21 of the 22 relevant occurrences of עבד found in the scrolls. Otherwise, the distribution throughout 1QH is fairly even. Thirteen out of 17 possible nouns are represented in this document. The primary feature of CD is its 42 occurrences of ישראל. This figure is by far the largest concentration of this nominal form in any single document. Overall, CD contains 10 of the 17 possible nominal forms. There are no significant clusters of nominal forms in 1QpHab; this document contains 7 of the 17 specified nominal forms. The document 4QDibHam contains only 3 of the specified nouns-- גוי, ישראל, and עם.

The distribution of individual nominal forms throughout the various scrolls is worth noting. The only noun to have a relevant occurrence in only 1 document (1QS) is עד. The noun עבד has relevant occurrences only in 1QS and 1QH whereas נחלה is found only in 1QM and 1QH. The widest distribution is accorded ישראל; there are relevant occurrences of this word in 18 different documents. Interestingly enough, this word does not appear at all in 1QH. Fifteen documents (with the exception of 1QS) contain relevant occurrences of גוי. As an expression of election עם is found in 14 different documents. There are relevant usages of עדה and יחד in 11 documents. The nominal form יחד is not applied to the elect group in 1QM although it is used as an adverb in that document.

The following section is designed to examine representative samples of the occurrences just noted in order to determine the composition of the elect and non-elect groups in the various Dead Sea Scrolls.

Identification of the Elect and the Non-Elect

The same procedure will be used in this section as was used in the second section of chapter four. The three questions pertaining to the Dead Sea Scrolls are: (1) Who is considered elect? (2) Who is excluded from being elect? (3) How does one become elect? Responses to these questions will be catalogued in three sub-sections.

Who is Considered Elect?

The verbal form אהב is used in several different ways to indicate the identity of the elect. In the Manual of Discipline, the standard formula (i.e., God as subject of the verb and the elect group as object) is not present. Nevertheless, three relevant references testify to the Qumran sect's view of itself and of those who were believed to comprise the elect group. In one reference, it is said that God loves the Spirit of Light[1] (1QS 3:26). The implication is that God loves those who follow the Spirit of Light; i.e., he loves the sectarians of Qumran who are called the "Sons of Light" in the same passage. In the other two references in 1QS, members of the sect are told to love the chosen and hate those whom God despises (1QS 1:3), and to love the "Sons of Light" and hate the "Sons

---

[1] In the Qumran literature, the Spirit of Light and the Spirit of Darkness are often contrasted. The former represents "good" and is often linked directly with the sect group from Qumran. The latter represents "evil" and is usually associated with the non-elect.

Darkness" (1QS 1:9). The obvious conclusion in both references is that the sectarians are the elect since the "Sons of Light" are described as those who are united by a special covenant in the "Council of God" (עצת אל). The emphasis in all three references in 1QS is on the ability of individuals to choose to live in a prescribed manner and therefore become part of the elect group. A member of the elect group is described in 1QH as one who loves what God loves and hates what God hates (1QH 14:10; 17:24), and, in addition, he keeps God's commandments (1QH 16:13). Here again, the emphasis is on a description of the elect as those who live in a prescribed manner. The Damascus Document contains several references of the same type. One passage refers to God's love of knowledge in a context which indicates that only a member of the sect group has access to this knowledge (CD 2:3). Hence, God has a particular affinity for members of the sect. In CD 20:21, it is affirmed that God shows mercy to those who love him. The requirements for those loving God are to be righteous and serve him. The precise meaning of these requirements is defined in another passage. In a commentary on Deuteronomy 7:8a and 9:5a (both of which deal with the election of the people Israel), it is said that the elect group is comprised of all who have turned from the impiety of Israel. God loves these "converts" from the ways of the people; they are the heirs to the covenant God made with the fathers.

> Thus is the case with those that turned (from) Israel, who forsook the way of the people, who bore witness against the people for his sake. He loves them that come after them, for theirs is the covenant of the fathers (CD 8:17-18 // 19:30-31).[1]

---

[1] Whenever two figures are given for the same reference in CD, this indicates an overlapping of manuscript A and B. The first figure given refers to manuscript A; the second is manuscript B.

This passage contains a clear enunciation of what is implied in the other passages using אהב . The elect group is not just an ethnic unit, but it is a group of individuals who have made a specific commitment to follow a prescribed way of life; this commitment distinguishes the elect from the non-elect and even Israelite from Israelite. The only exception to this understanding of the elect (in passages using אהב) is found in 4QDibHam 4:4 where a strictly ethnic understanding of the elect is presented. "Because you have loved Israel more than all peoples you have chosen the tribe of Judah . . ." (4QDibHam 4:4-5).

The principle of separation as a means of identifying the elect group is affirmed very strongly with the verbal form בדל . As part of the requirement for entrance into the sect, the initiate is instructed that henceforth he is to separate himself (as part of the elect group) from the non-elect (1QS 5:1, 10). This theme is further developed by the assertion that nothing which was hidden from Israel will be hidden from the new member of the elect group; the initiate joins those who are set apart as holy (1QS 8:11). To preserve the society of the elect group, it will be necessary to separate from men of perversity by living in the desert.

> And when these things come to pass for the Community of Israel at these appointed times, they shall be separated from the midst of the habitation of perverse men to go into the desert to prepare the way of 'Him' (1QS 8:12-13).

Even the possessions of the elect are not to be mingled with the "men of deceit" (i.e., the non-elect) (1QS 9:9). The same definition of the elect is affirmed in the Damascus Document. Those who are members of the covenant (i.e., the Essenes) must keep themselves separate from the "children of the pit" (בני השחת) (CD 6:14). The only possible reference using בדל to define the elect as an ethnic entity is found in a priestly liturgy where it is affirmed that the people, who remain unspecified, were separated from all other peoples to be a holy people unto God.

> But you have chosen for yourself a people at your pleasure for you have remembered your covenant (fragmentary) to separate them to yourself from all the peoples for a holy object and you have renewed your covenant for them. . . (34 3:2:6).

Most of the references in which בדל appears indicate a definition of the elect group which is rather narrowly construed. Not even all Israelites are conceived to be elect. Again, the emphasis is on the elect as those who subscribe to a particular style of life.

All relevant references in the Manual of Discipline using בחר define the elect as the sect group only. Thus, God has chosen the "just" and the "perfect of way" (both cryptic terms for the members of the sect) for an everlasting covenant (1QS 4:22). In 1QS 11:7-8, the elect group is defined as the opposite of the "assembly of flesh" (מסוד בשר).

> The fountain of righteousness, the reservoir of power, and the dwelling-place of glory are denied to the assembly of flesh, but God has given them as an everlasting possession to those whom he has chosen.

The emphasis throughout the passage is on the special revelation of knowledge which God has granted to the elect. The only relevant occurrence of בחר in the War Scroll would seem to refer to the elect in ethnic terms. God's people Israel have been chosen from all the peoples of the earth (1QM 10:9). However, there is no way of proving precisely from the text whether "Israel" is an all-inclusive ethnic term or whether it refers only to those Israelites who have made a particular religious affirmation. The following verse (1QM 10:10) contains the statement "people of the saints of the covenant" (i.e,, the Essenes) so it appears that the all-inclusive ethnic term is, in fact, being applied only to the sect group; it is this group which is considered to have been chosen from all the peoples of the earth. This view is confirmed in the Hymn Scroll. God has chosen his "holy ones" from among all (men) forever; it is they who serve God (1QH 15:23-24). Another reference in the Hymn Scroll is fragmentary. The object of בחר is missing, but the context is such that it is evident that the elect is comprised only of members of the Qumran sect (1QH 17:21). All pertinent occurrences of בחר in the Damascus Document refer only to the non-elect and their fate; these will be analyzed in the next sub-section. The definition of the elect in 4QDibHam is rather broadly based. In one passage, it is the tribe of Judah whom God has chosen to lead his people Israel. Within the tribal unit, the validity of the davidic dynastic covenant finds its expression (4QDibHam 4:5).[1] This selection of David and Judah is to be understood as a call to a particular function within the elect rather than an exclusive call to be the elect since the preceding verse (4QDibHam 4:4) affirms that God loved Israel (the entire ethnic unit) more than all other peoples of the world. Another passage is rather fragmentary, but the context in which it is found suggests that the ethnic people Israel are the elect whom God has chosen from all the peoples of the earth (4QDibHam 3:9). Another reference to the election of the entire people is found in a priestly liturgy where it is affirmed that they were chosen from all other peoples to be God's holy people (34 3:2:6). However, no specific terms, e.g., יהודה or ישראל , are applied to the objects of election in this passage. In the Book of Blessings, the chosen are defined as those who fear

---

[1] This choice of Judah parallels the description found in Psalm 78:68 although, contrary to the Old Testament passage, there is no reference to the rejection of Northern Israel.

God; cling to his covenant; and walk perfectly in the ways of truth (1QSb 1:1-3). In another instance, the objects of God's choice are the "Sons of Zadok" whose task it is to establish his covenant forever in the midst of his people (1QSb 3:22-23). This is election to a particular function within the larger elect group; it is an election very similar in type to that expressed for Judah and the davidic dynasty in 4QDibHam 4:5. Both references in 1QSb limit the elect to the sect group only. The emphasis on "truth" and "covenant" is a further indication of the sectarian view of the elect. Overall, the uses of בחר to express election are not totally consistent. The membership of the elect group varies between two definitions--the ethnic entity Israel and the sect group only. The latter (which represents the majority of references in the scrolls) is characterized by such terms as the "just" or the "holy ones." The document 4QDibHam refers only to ethnic Israel as the elect group. This definition of the elect is consistent with references already cited from 4QDibHam.

The verbal form חזק is used only occasionally in the Dead Sea Scrolls to express God's "seizing" a particular group as his elect. More often, the emphasis is on man's "seizing" or "clinging to" a particular covenant of God. This latter usage of חזק (while not the typical formula with deity as subject and the elect group as object) is very helpful in determining who is considered part of the elect group. In a number of occurrences, a member of the elect is one who clings to God's commandments as expressed through his covenant (cf. 1QS 5:1, 3; 1QH 2:28; 18:9; CD 3:20; 7:13; 20:27). A typical expression of this belief is: "For it is you who has created the just and the wicked (fragmentary) I wish to cling to your covenant forever" (1QH 4:38-39). These commandments are interpreted through the teachings of the sect; the covenant itself is the special agreement which binds all the sectarians to each other and to God. This emphasis on obedience to a specific norm narrows the composition of the elect exclusively to those who can measure up to rigid standards of performance. In none of these references is ethnicity suggested as the basis for being elect. One occurrence of חזק in the War Scroll is rather interesting. It relates how God seized Ithamar for an eternal covenant (1QM 17:3). Presumably Eleazar was also the object of God's action, but a lacuna in the manuscript prevents definite identification.[1] The passage strongly affirms the dominant position of the priest in the Essenic community. Yet, it is rather curious that the legitimacy of the non-Zadokite priestly line is implied here since the Qumran community was based on the priesthood of the legitimate Zadokite line. One must contrast this with the affirmation that God chose the priests, the sons of Zadok, to establish (חזק) his covenant and precepts forever (1QSb 3:23).

The verbal form ידע is never used in the Dead Sea Scrolls to convey election thought in the classical sense (as it appears in Amos 3:2). The vast majority of references are to human knowledge; a few refer to God's knowledge, but never is the elect group the direct object of ידע. However, some passages are helpful in giving a further understanding of the composition of the elect group. For example, there is an emphasis placed on esoteric truths available only to the select few. God made known to the Teacher of Righteousness all the mysteries of the prophets (1QpHab 7:4) as well as all the secrets of truth (1QH 11:9). This special knowledge, of course, was passed on only to the followers of the Teacher of Righteousness, i.e., the sectarians of Qumran. In another instance, God is said to have foreknown of the existence of the sect group. "You have magnified (your elect) marvellously. And you have kept for us your covenant from former times and have opened for us the gates of salvation many times. . ." (1QM 18:7). Other pertinent passages include two usages of ידע in the Hymn Scroll. The individual sect member affirms his belief that God has known him and aided him since his formation in his mother's womb (1QH 9:30). Also important is the affirmation by the sectarian that the men of holiness, i.e., the Essenes, have been chosen from all men forever (1QH 15:22-23). Finally, in CD 1:8-11, the elect group is defined as those priests and laymen (among the Israelites) who knew their iniquity but floundered in their ignorance until God raised up the Teacher of Righteousness to guide them. All the pertinent references containing ידע define the elect group in a narrow, exclusive manner; the elect is composed only of those who have access to the special knowledge God has revealed to the Teacher of Righteousness. This means, in effect, that the elect status is limited to duly initiated members (in good standing) of the Essenic brotherhood.

---

[1] Ithamar and Eleazar, as sons of Aaron, are paired together in Lev. 10:1 ff.; Num. 3:4; and I Chr. 6:3; 24:1 ff. Therefore, it seems likely that it is the name "Eleazar" which is missing.

The three relevant occurrences of פדה are found in the Hymn Scroll. Two references simply affirm that God has redeemed the soul of the sectarian from adversity (1QH 2:35; 3:19). The third reference is more explicit. The individual praises God for delivering his soul from the "interpreters of falsehood" (מליצי כזב) and the "congregation of those who seek smooth things" (עדת דורשי הלקות) (1QH 2:31-32).[1] This reference clearly defines the elect as members of the sect only. Those who do not accept the doctrines of the Teacher of Righteousness are not considered elect even if they are fellow members of the same ethnic group as the sectarians.

---

[1] These epithets are applied to those Jews (especially Pharisees) who refused to follow the sectarian interpretation of the law. See Allegro, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 159; and Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, pp. 59, 73.

The uses of קרא are helpful in determining the composition of the elect group. In the War Scroll, the people (i.e., the "Sons of Light") are instructed to inscribe on their trumpets and battle standards "called of God" (1QM 3:2; 4:10). In another reference, the elect are described as members of God's covenant whom he has redeemed and called to a glorious fate.

> Blessed be the God of Israel who keeps favour unto his covenant and testimonies of salvation to the people whom he has redeemed. He has called them that staggered to (fragmentary) but has wiped out the assembly of the nations unto destruction, leaving no remnant (1QM 14:4-5).

Even though the passage does not contain a precise definition of the elect, the emphasis on the covenant along with a reference in 1QM 14:7 to the "perfect of way" (before whom the wicked nations will vanish) strongly suggests that it is the Qumran community for whom the acts of salvation are accomplished. A very helpful passage is found in the Damascus Document. Based on an interpretation of Numbers 21:18,[1] the ancient writer asserts that God remembered the covenant of the patriarchs. He raised up "converts" of Israel (i.e., the sectarians) who were forced to flee into exile in Damascus. These "converts" sought God through diligent study of the Law as taught by the Teacher of Righteousness (CD 6:2-9). Consequently, the writer appropriates the past, but he narrows the present elect group to just those who follow the "correct" teachings. Although it is not explicitly stated, one gains the distinct impression that the sect is envisioned as a

---

[1] The various terms in Numbers 21:18 are applied to the Essenes.

"new covenant" group which fulfills and deepens the older "Covenant of the Patriarchs." Finally, there are three pertinent occurrences of קרא in 4QDibHam. As was the case with other verbal forms, the elect are defined in ethnic terms with no mention being made of obedience to specific norms as a requirement for election. Israel is affirmed as the first-born of God which was given rank before all nations forever (4QDibHam 3:5). The elect people have been made for the eyes of the goyim; even God's name has been called upon the elect (4QDibHam 2:12). Despite their faults, God has called the elect because of his love for them. ". . . in spite of our faults, you have called us. . ." (4QDibHam 2:15).

Analysis of the verbal forms shows that in the majority of references the sect, i.e., the Essenes, is considered to be the elect group. There is no disaffirmation of the elect status of the fathers or the patriarchs; in several passages, the elect status of these ancestors is specifically affirmed and then appropriated in behalf of the Essenes (who represent the continuing fulfillment of that elect status). There is, however, a noticeable lack of references indicating that non-Essenes, who are ethnically Israelites, are part of the elect group. This generalization holds true for all documents except for 4QDibHam where the elect are defined consistently in ethnic terms. In the rest of the Qumran literature, much stress is placed on the necessity of adherence to specific precepts or to the "truth" as a prerequisite for inclusion in the elect group. The role of the Teacher of Righteousness, as the correct interpreter of the law, and revealer of the truth, is very much in evidence throughout passages which contain the specified verbal forms. None of the verbal references is used in such a manner as to suggest that non-Israelites (or even non-Judeans) were eligible to join the elect group by being initiated as members of the Essenes.

The nominal form אביון is used exclusively to refer to the Qumran sectarians as the elect group. In the Habakkuk Commentary the "poor ones" are oppressed by the Wicked Priest. However, the elect are assured that the iniquities of the Wicked Priest are to be punished.

> The explanation of this word concerns the Wicked Priest inasmuch as he will be paid his reward for what he has done to the Poor Ones. . . . For God will condemn him to destruction even as he himself planned to destroy the Poor Ones (1QpHab 12:2-6).

In another passage, the forces of Belial (representing the non-elect) are to be defeated by the "poor ones" whom God has redeemed (1QM 11:9). Elsewhere, it is affirmed that the "poor ones" will triumph over their enemies from all lands (1QM 11:13); the hand of God is with the "poor ones" in the battle against the "forces of darkness" (the non-elect) (1QM 13:14). Typically, most of the references in the Hymn Scroll are in the singular. The individual sectarian gives thanks to God for the redemption of the soul of the "poor one" from the forces of evil (1QH 2:32; 3:25; 5:16, 18). The plural form appears in a passage where the individual speaking (presumably the Teacher of Righteousness) gives thanks for being placed in the midst of the "poor ones of grace" (אביני חסד) in order to help these elect achieve salvation (1QH 5:22). Overall, the uses of אביון serve to isolate the elect as sect members only. The "poor ones" are defined as the opposite of the forces of wickedness. This latter category includes all who oppose in any way the teachings of the Essenes. Thus, certain Israelites (such as the Wicked Priest and his followers), as well as non-Israelites, are not included as part of the elect.

In the Habakkuk Commentary, בחיר is applied exclusively to the sectarians of Qumran. They become the means by which God will judge all the nations (גוים), but, even more significant, the elect are to chastize all the wicked of God's people (i.e., those Jews who still adhered to the teachings of the enemies of the sect) because only the elect have kept God's commandments (1QpHab 5:4-5). The same theme recurs in the Manual of Discipline although the wicked are not so carefully defined.

> It is the house of holiness for Israel and the company of great holiness for Aaron; they are the witnesses of truth unto judgment and the chosen of loving-kindness appointed to offer expiation for the earth and to bring down punishment upon the wicked (1QS 8:5-6).

In the War Scroll, the "elect of the holy people" are seen as the earthly counterpart of the saints and angels in heaven. The elect are also heirs to God's covenant of peace (1QM 12:1-3). Elsewhere, members of the "congregation of his elect" are compared to a precious stone of lapis lazuli, whereas all others (i.e., the non-elect) are compared to a plain stone which is of little or no value. "Its interpretation is that they have founded the Council of the Community, the priests and the people, a congregation of his elect, like a stone of lapis lazuli among the stones. . ." (4QpIsa 1:3). In the Hymn Scroll, the Teacher of Righteousness is acknowledged as the correct interpreter of knowledge for the "elect of righteousness;" his task is to continually teach them orthodoxy (1QH 2:13). In another passage, God's elect are equated with truth; by contrast, all perversity is to be destroyed by God (1QH 14:15). Both of these references clearly limit the elect to those who follow the teachings of the Qumran sect. The distinction between elect and non-elect is not at all blurred. Finally, in the Damascus Document, an interpretation of Ezekiel 44:15[1] contains affirmation of the priestly nature of the Essenes. The Sons of Zadok are said to be the "elect of Israel" who will arise at the end of days (CD 4:1-4). In the same passage, mention is made of the priests (and presumably the Levites although they are not named) as converts of Israel who fled from Judah. Consequently, there is little doubt that the elect are those who have made a specific commitment to a particular understanding of the law. Typically, in usages of בחיר, the sectarians, as the elect, are distinguished from the non-elect whose chief characteristic is wickedness. As has been noted in the analysis of other nominal forms, adherence to the doctrines of the Teacher of Righteousness (and those of his interpreters) is the prime prerequisite for inclusion in the elect group.

---

[1] In quoting Ezekiel, the writer of CD wrote "the priests and the Levites and the Sons of Zadok," (הכהנים והלוים ובניצדוק). The MT, however, reads "the levitical priests, the sons of Zadok," (הלוים בני צדוק והכהנים). There is no ו joining the terms in the MT.

The term יחד is applied only to the elect group, i.e., the Essenic community. The predominance of this term in the Manual of Discipline is a phenomenon worth noting again.[1] Sometimes this word is a simple title for the elect group (1QS 1:1; 3:7; 6:24; 8:19). An example of this usage is: "And this is the rule for the members of the Community, for those who volunteer to be converted from all evil and to cling to all his commands according to his will" (1QS 5:1). Elsewhere, יחד is combined with other words, e.g., "the community of God" (1QS 1:12), "the community of truth" (1QS 2:24, 26), and "the holy community" (1QS 9:2). In all of these references "the community" is a carefully delineated entity governed by regulations which determine who is considered part of "the community" and who is excluded from it.

The phrase "men of the community" (1QS 5:16; 6:21; 7:20; 9:6) has led

---

[1] The reader is referred to section one of this chapter for a numerical analysis of the occurrences of יחד in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Barthelemy to suggest that the Manual of Discipline (which he labels the "Rule of the Community") was written for a quasi-monastic community in which the elect group was limited to men only.[1] Cross also notes that the term יחד appears quite often in reference to the celibate community at Qumran, but he contends that יחד is also used in the Manual of Discipline to refer to the whole "community of God," especially with eschatological overtones, e.g., 1QS 2:22; 3:11-12; 5:5-6.[2] Dupont-Sommer contends that the יחד includes women and children as well as men. In short, it refers to all the sectarians and their families.[3] The position of Cross seems to be most sound. Certainly reference to the "men of the community" must be taken as an attempt to speak to a particular group, a group which may well have been quasi-monastic. Yet, the fact that the writer(s) felt compelled to qualify יחד with אנש seems to mitigate the impact of Barthelemy's contention. If יחד applies only to male celibates, it would seem unnecessary to include אנש at all; יחד alone should be sufficient. The situation seems to exist as Cross portrays it. The noun יחד is used in the Manual of Discipline to refer both to the celibate group alone and to the larger group of the elect (female as well as male). This ambiguity is one more indication of variation among the Essenes regarding the desirability of marriage.[1] There is no indication at all that either use of the term points to a group considered of higher elect status than the other. References to יחד in other documents of the Qumran scrolls are rather sparse by comparison with the large number found in 1QS. In the Rule Annex (1QSa), יחד is most often used with a qualifying noun, e.g., "council of the community" (עצת יחד) (1QSa 1:26, 27; 2:2, 11) or "congregation of the community" (עדת היחד) (1QSa 2:21). The עצת יחד appears to be a group of leaders convened from out of the elect group (which in 1QSa obviously includes men, women, and children)[2] rather than the elect group in its entirety. The phrase עדת היחד is rather curious. Barthelemy translates this simply "members of the congregation."[3] Thus, in effect, he ignores any connection between יחד and עדה . Dupont-Sommer, by contrast, maintains that the redundancy of the expression indicates that the terms יחד and עדה are practically synonymous.[4] In any event, this usage applies to the entire elect group. In the Damascus Document, references to the "community" (spelled יחיד) are found only in CD 20 (Manuscript B). The phrase "teacher of the community" occurs twice (CD 20:1, 14). The other reference is to the "men of the community" (CD 20:32). However, as Cross rightly points out, all these references seem to be used only of the "community" of the founder, i.e., that of the Teacher of Righteousness.[1] It is possible that they define a monastic community which existed during the early period of crisis. However, the reference in CD 20:13 to subsequent members of the covenant and their families indicates that the composition of the elect group was not just male only. In all the occurrences in the Damascus Document, continued membership in the יחיד is based on one's loyalty to the prescribed rules and regulations as manifest in the ברית of the יחיד . The same requirement for membership in the elect is found in the יחד of both 1QS and 1QSa. This same phenomenon is attested in the few occurrences of יחד in other documents, e.g., 4QPB 5; 1QSb 5:21. Overall, the nominal form יחד has a mixed usage: sometimes it refers to a celibate community of males; sometimes it refers to men, women, and children. In all cases, however, it refers only to the Essenes, the elect group. Never is the term applied to the non-elect. Adherence to a particular style of life is very much a requirement for continued membership in the יחד .

---

[1] D. Barthelémy, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, I, 108. He distinguishes between the composition of "the community" (יחד) and that of "the congregation" (עדה) which is typical of 1QSa. He believes 1QS was written specifically for the monks at Qumran whereas 1QSa was written for the Hasidim, the forerunners of the Essenes.

[2] Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 72-80, 97. Cross makes no distinction between עדה and יחד when the latter is used of the "whole community." Neither does he state that 1QS was written only for the celibate community at Qumran even though certain phrases seem to apply only to the celibates. He does believe that יחד is applied only to the principal settlement of the Essenes in the desert (of which not all members were celibate) whereas the term "camps" (מחנות) is applied to the other settlements of the Essenes.

[3] Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 104. He equates יחד and עדה as interchangeable. Neither applies only to celibate men.

---

[1] For discussion on the question of the Essenes and celibacy, the reader is referred to chapter two, pp. 65 ff.

[2] In 1QSa 1:4, women and children are included in the elect group. Certainly 1QSa is addressed to the structuring of the future ideal eschatological community (1QSa 1:1), but, as Cross points out, the "apocalyptic community" is at the same time both the future congregation of the elect and the "present" sect. See Cross, *Ancient Library*, p. 87. Therefore, there is no need to eliminate women and children from the present elect group.

[3] Barthelémy, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, I, 117.

[4] Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, p. 104.

In the Manual of Discipline the sect is viewed as the house of holiness for Israel (1QS 8:5) and the house of perfection and truth in Israel (1QS 8:9), but it is also the depository of knowledge which is hidden from Israel (1QS 8:11). The emphasis throughout 1QS is on obedience to the "truth" as the primary sign of the true Israel. In the War Scroll, the term ישראל is used of the elect, but is always used with an eschatological meaning, and it is always linked very closely to the sect members.

---

[1] Cross, Ancient Library, p. 80.

There are several references to the participation of the tribes of Israel in the final cataclysmic battle, but it is only through the good graces of the sectarians that the tribes are included.

> On the great standard which is at the head of all the people they shall write, 'People of God,' together with the names of Israel and Aaron and the names of the twelve (tribes of Israel) according to their genealogy (1QM 3:13-14).

The final war will be a time of distress for Israel (1QM 15:1). The traditional affirmation of Israel as the chosen people is qualified by the definition of these people as the saints of the covenant, i.e., those who are learned in the precepts (1QM 10:9-10). In the end-time, the dominion of Israel will be over all flesh, but this affirmation, too, is qualified by the indication that it is the sons of truth (the covenant members) who will comprise Israel (1QM 17:7-8). Thus, there is no suggestion in the War Scroll that ethnic Israel is elect. At best, within an eschatological frame of reference, there is the possibility that some non-elect members will be deemed worthy of inclusion in the elect group. Perhaps more significant is the distinct impression given by the ancient writer that the imminent crisis of the end-time is producing a "new Israel" grounded in the truth and the covenant as interpreted by the sectarians. Obviously, this is not based on ethnicity alone, but, rather, it is based on response to the will of God as perceived within narrowly defined limits. The same concept of a "new Israel" seems to be affirmed in another document. Reference is made to the time of trial which will come upon the "elect of Israel" at the end of days (4QFl 1:19). In the Damascus Document, the sectarians are the "remnant of Israel."

> But with them that held fast to the commandments of God--those who were left over of them--God established his covenant with Israel even until

> eternity, by revealing to them hidden things concerning which all Israel had gone astray (CD 3:12-14).

Through them God has built a sure house in Israel (CD 3:19). In several passages there is an indication of the "new Israel" expressed in terms similar to that found in the War Scroll. The faithfulness of the sectarians has justified the establishment of a new covenant for all Israel forever (CD 3:12; 15:5). Both references attest to the belief that only through the teachings of the sect group can a member of ethnic Israel become part of the elect group, the "new Israel." Generally, in the Qumran literature, the term ישראל does not define an ethnic entity as the elect. The one conspicuous exception to this statement is found in 4QDibHam where the whole people Israel are continually referred to as the elect group (cf. 4QDibHam 3:6; 4:7, 9; 5:7, 11). However, the term ישראל usually refers to an elect (assuredly Israelite in ethnic background) whose membership is determined by adherence to the demands of a specific covenantal relationship. This usage seems to imply belief in a "new Israel" which supercedes and, at the same time, fulfills the "old Israel" which was ethnically derived.

In the War Scroll, a petition is addressed to God to rise up in battle; defeat the enemies of the elect; and fill his land with glory and his inheritance (נחלה) with blessing. "Strike the nations your enemies and let your sword devour guilty flesh. Fill your land with glory and your inheritance with blessing" (1QM 12:11-12). Although it is not specifically stated, the eschatological context in which this reference is placed indicates that the נחלה is the present sect group itself joined by the faithful from Israel in the new age (cf. 1QM12:1 ff.). A more specific reference to the sect occurs in the Hymn Scroll. The writer expresses the belief that God will raise up survivors among his people and a remnant in the midst of his inheritance. He then declares that the remnant will be purified from sin, and its members will know God's truth (1QH 6:8-9). Clearly, it is the sectarians who are envisioned as the elect remnant; the dual emphasis on truth and purity is typical of the Essenic mind.

The nominal form סוד is usually used to indicate a gathered "assembly" (whether the elect or the non-elect are being discussed). Generally, it is used in combination with another noun so that the particular meaning of the phrase is quite clear. As a rule, however, there is no specific indication as to whether the סוד is composed of males only or whether women and children are included. The only exception occurs when a sectarian (presumably the Teacher of Righteousness) speaks of the "men of my assembly" (1QH 14:18). When used to refer to the elect, it is clear that the סוד is comprised only of the Essenes (and presumably their families also). Those who walk in the ways of God, as part of the community of truth, are members of an "everlasting assembly" (1QS 2:24-26). The "assembly" of those who have been chosen (the sectarians) has been united with the sons of heaven, i.e., the angels (1QS 11:7-8). Those who are members of God's covenant are ranked in the "assembly of the saints" (i.e., with the angels) (1QH 4:25). Those who entered the "new covenant" in the land of Damascus are included in the "assembly of the people" only if they have remained faithful to the principles of the covenant (CD 8:21 // 19:33-35). The typical references show a decidedly sectarian bias; an emphasis on "truth" and "covenant" is predominant. Only the Essenes are united with deity and the angelic beings because only the sectarians are the elect.

All relevant occurrences of עבד are in the singular. The only relevant occurrence outside of the Hymn Scroll is found in the Manual of Discipline. God opens the heart of his servant to special knowledge (1QS 11:16). This typically sectarian emphasis helps define the elect as those who possess a unique relationship to God. Various references in the Hymn Scroll also attest to the unique position of the Essene as a member of the elect group. The spirit of God has been poured out upon the servant to cleanse him and enable him to fulfill the will of God (1QH 13:18; 16:12; 17:26). The servant of God is one who hates every work of perversity. "And I have chosen to cleanse my hands according to (fragmentary) and the soul of your servant has (fragmentary) every work of perversity" (1QH 16:10-11). Once again the sectarian emphasis on clearly defined notions of what is good and what is evil is apparent. The idea of the עבד as the possession of God (as signified by the possessive pronouns) is not applied to non-Essenes, except when reference is made to past figures, e.g., David (1QM 11:2) or the prophets (1QpHab 2:9; 7:5; 1QS 1:3). Consequently, the use of עבד is limited to the elect, either past or present, in all cases.

Only once in the Qumran litereature is עד used to define the elect. The sectarians are described as "witnesses of truth unto judgment."

> It is the house of holiness for Israel and the company of great holiness for Aaron; they are the witnesses of truth unto judgment and the chosen of loving-kindness appointed to offer expiation for the earth and to bring down punishment upon the wicked (1QS 8:5-6).

This epithet is just one of a series describing the attributes of the community of Essenes. The emphasis on "truth" is typical of the sectarian mentality. The elect possess special knowledge which is not available to non-Essenes (the non-elect).

It has already been suggested that there is some disagreement among scholars about the precise meaning of יחד and עדה. Briefly stated, Dupont-Sommer believes the two terms are completely interchangeable and that both apply to the whole Essenic sect.[1] Cross, by contrast, believes יחד is limited to the desert settlement of the Essenes only and that this settlement is primarily, though not exclusively, celibate males. Therefore, יחד in many instances may refer only to the celibate order of Essenes. By contrast, the term עדה applies always to the totality of the Essenes, those who live in the desert and those who do not as well as those who are married and their families and those who are not.[2] Thus, Cross views עדה as a more inclusive term than יחד . Regardless of which position is accepted--Cross seems the more convincing to this writer--there is no disagreement between the two scholars that both terms apply equally to the elect group, whether in its totality or in one particular aspect of it. From the standpoint of Cross, the עדה includes the יחד, but he does not make any distinction between the degree of electness inherent in each term. The term עדה ("congregation") is frequently used with further modification when referring to the elect group. In the Manual of Discipline, a potential member of the elect group must be examined to determine his worthiness before being allowed to enter the covenant of the "congregation of holiness" (1QS 5:20-21). The same phrase "congregation of holiness" also occurs in 1QSa 1:9, 12. These, too, refer only to the sect of Essenes and the requirements for entrance into the elect community. A typical expression of the writer of 1QSa is the phrase "congregation of Israel."

---

[1] Dupont-Sommer, Essene Writings, p. 104.

[2] Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 79-80. Barthelémy, too, distinguishes between יחד and עדה . See Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, I, 108.

> And this is the rule for all the Congregation of Israel at the end of days, when they shall join (fragmentary) in obedience to the law of the sons of Zadok the priests and of the members of their Covenant who have (fragmentary) the way of the people (1QSa 1:1-2).

Since this is an eschatological term[1] (which does not occur elsewhere in the Essene literature), it is unlikely that any ethnic identification of the elect is being suggested. Rather, this refers only to those Jews (men, women, and children) who are inclined to follow the precepts of the covenant as defined by the Essenes (1QSa 1:4). In the War Scroll, the elect belong to the congregation which is "summoned by God" (1QM 3:2); they are members of "his congregation" (1QM 2:5). God is in the midst of the elect congregation (1QM 12:9). Another interesting occurrence of עדה is found in the Hymn Scroll. The member of the elect has been purged from sin so that he might enter into communion with the "congregation of the Sons of Heaven" (1QH 3:21-22). Elsewhere the sect member is described as part of the "congregation of the men of perfect holiness" (תמים הקדש עדת אנשי) (CD 20:2). In the commentaries, the elect are defined as the "congregation of his elect" (4QpIsa 1:3; 4QpPs37 2:5; 3:5) or the "congregation of poor ones" (4QpPs37 3:10); i.e., they are those who have separated from evil in order to do the will of God. When עדה is used of the elect, it is always the sectarians who are meant. The emphasis on separation from sin, personal holiness, and union with heavenly beings indicates a rather restricted notion of the elect. In none of the usages is the concept of the election of an ethnic people affirmed.

---

[1] See Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 87, 96-98. Barthelémy, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, I, 108, suggests that the term "congregation of Israel" refers to the Hasidim rather than the Essenes since women and children are included. This suggestion reflects a failure to understand the ambiguous attitude of the Essenes toward marriage.

The largest single block of relevant occurrences of עם is found in the War Scroll. In all cases, it is the sect group which is being described. The elect are called "people of God" (1QM 3:13); they are distinguished from the forces of darkness; only these elect will be saved in the final battle (1QM 1:5, 12). The sectarians are called the "people of the saints of the covenant" (1QM 10:10) or the "saints of his people" (1QM 6:6). They are a "holy people" bound in a special covenant with God (1QM 12:1). The sectarians are portrayed as an "everlasting people;" they are the survivors of the covenant made with the fathers and the witnesses to God's words of truth (1QM 13:7-9; 14:12). The concept of a remnant is also found in 1QH 6:8 where the sectarians (who have been purified from all sin) become the survivors among God's people. The context is such that this anticipated salvation is, in reality, a *fait accompli*. The emphasis on purification from sins along with an emphasis on truth makes it clear that the sectarians assume the elect status formerly available to ethnic Israel. The term "people of God" refers only to the sectarians in 1QSb. Blessings are given for the priest (1QSb 4:27) and the lay leader (1QSb 5:21) as they seek to establish the ordinances and renew the covenant in the midst of his elect people. In one instance, the priests are to establish the covenant forever.

> Words of blessing for the man (fragmentary) the sons of Zadok the priests whom God has chosen to establish his covenant forever (and to test) all his ordinances in the midst of his people and to instruct them according to his command (1QSb 3:22-23).

Elsewhere in the scrolls God's people are distinguished from the "princes of wickedness" (4QpPs37 3:7). There is no question that here the sectarians, with their penchant for holiness and purity from sin, are the elect of God.

Only one occurrence of עם pertains to the elect in the Damascus Document. All those who have fallen away from the "new covenant" shall not be counted as part of the "assembly of the people" (סוד עם) because of their faithlessness (CD 19:34-35). What this is describing is, in effect, excommunication from the elect group. All of the references cited above use עם to define the sect group alone as the elect, but all the references in 4QDibHam define ethnic Israel as the elect group. In several instances the elect people are defined in contrast to the גוים(non-elect) (4QDibHam 2:11; 4:7, 11). In other passages, an appeal is made to God to bring together all his people Israel who live in the countries where God has banished them (4QDibHam 5:11; 6:12). Though all Israel is scattered among the nations, nevertheless, the elect status of the ethnic people is still affirmed. There is a significant difference between these definitions of the elect and those found in the other Qumran documents.

Only in the Damascus Document does פליטה refer to the elect. It is stated that God raises up a remnant for himself in every generation.

> And in all of them he raised for himself (men) called by name, in order to leave a remnant for the land to to fill the face of the universe with their seed. And he made known to them his holy spirit by the hand of his anointed, and he showed the truth (CD 2:11-13).

The emphasis on truth as well as the giving of the holy spirit makes it quite clear that it is the sectarians who are the remnant in the present generation. They place themselves in the long line of the elect who have had a special relationship to deity in every generation.

The term קדוש is used in the scrolls to refer to two distinct groups: (1) the heavenly beings who are with God; and (2) the sectarians. The term never refers to the non-elect, regardless of whether they are non-Israelites or Israelites who are not members of the sect. Occurrences of קדוש referring to the heavenly beings are found in both the War Scroll and the Hymn Scroll. The sectarians affirm that the congregation of God's saints (i.e., angels) is in the midst of the elect to aid them in the final cataclysmic battle (1QM 12:7-8). The redeemed soul (i.e., the sectarian) has been cleansed from sin in order that he might have an intimate relationship with the "army of the saints" and the "congregation of the sons of heaven" (1QH 3:21-22). The "army of the saints" is the same type of reference as that already cited for the War Scroll; this term also appears elsewhere in the Hymn Scroll (1QH 10:35). The gist of all the references cited is that even the heavenly beings work in behalf of the elect group, and further, there is an intimacy, a direct connection, between the elect and heaven which does not exist for the non-elect. Apart from defining heavenly beings as the saints, members of the sect itself are also labeled "saints." It is they who become the instruments of God's wrath against the forces of evil in the final battle (1QM 6:6; 16:1; 18:2). A more specific identification of the elect is found in 1QM 10:10; the sectarians are described as the "people of the saints of the covenant." This emphasis on ברית is a typical theme pursuant to sectarian self-understanding. The sect group is also identified as the elect in 1QSb. The priests are given a mandate to perform specific tasks, which pertain to maintenance of the elect group, in the midst of the "saints" (1QSb 3:26; 4:23). One of these tasks is to instruct the sectarians that they might know the will of God. Here again, the sectarian emphasis on special knowledge is very much in evidence. Only those who are properly instructed are to be part of the elect group. It is interesting to note that the Damascus

Document does not contain any occurrences of קדוש relevant to an identification of the elect.

The nominal form קהל ("assembly") is applied to both the elect and the non-elect. Examples of the former include a reference to all the sectarians gathered together as the קהל .

> And when the order is given to (gather) the entire Assembly to dispense justice, or for the Council of the Community, or for military mobilization, they shall sanctify them for three days so that every member may be ready (1QSa 1:25-26).

In another document, the sectarians are labeled the "assembly of God" (1QM 4:10). This is one of the titles which is to be written on the battle standards of the "Sons of Light." Evidently, the purpose of these epithets is to identify clearly the warriers in the final eschatological battle as members of the elect. In the Damascus Document, an errant sectarian who profanes the Sabbath or other holy days is cut off from the קהל for a specified period of time. He is reinstated in the קהל only if he is healed (רפא) from his sin (CD 12:4-6). The status of the alleged penitent during his period of suspension is not defined. However, it seems likely that his elect status was in jeopardy since the suspension amounted to a temporary excommunication. Certainly the emphasis on correct observance helps define those elect within the קהל in a very specific manner. Complete obedience to particular regulations is essential to maintaining one's elect status. In the Nahum Commentary, the term קהל is applied to the Ephraimites. At the end of time, when the evil deeds of the "seekers of smooth things" are revealed to all Israel, and when the glory of Judah is ruined, the "simple ones of Ephraim" (פתאי אפרים) will flee from their קהל (forsaking those who mislead them) and join themselves to Israel, i.e., the faithful Essenes in Judah (4QpNah 3:3-5). The קהל in this instance includes both the wicked and the righteous. (This is the only reference of this type in the Qumran literature.) However, even though it is not clearly stated, the implication is that the faithful from Ephraim will join the faithful from Judah to form the true קהל ; this group will be responsive to the will of God.

The remnant concept, as expressed through the nominal form שארית , is used in several instances to describe the Essenes. The sect is characterized as the "remnant" and the "survivors" (מחיה) of God's covenant with the fathers (1QM 13:8). The same basic idea (using the same vocabulary) is found in the Hymn Scroll. The sectarian is confident that God will raise up "survivors" and a "remnant" from among the people Israel (1QH 6:8). In still another passage, the sect is characterized as a "remnant" left to Israel; this results from God's faithfulness in remembering his covenant with the patriarchs (CD 1:4-5). In all three passages cited, the sectarians see themselves as the true inheritors of the elect status of the past. The whole concept of the remnant is used to distinguish between the elect (the sectarians) and the non-elect (those Israelites who are no longer considered heirs to the election promises). However, even continued membership in the "remnant" is not guaranteed. The members of the covenant must continually watch their actions, lest they backslide from the correct way and thereby forfeit the right to any remnant (שארית) or survivors (פליטה).

> . . . but power and might and great wrath with flames of fire (by the hand) of all the angels of destruction against them that backslide from the way and those that abhor the ordinance, so that there shall be no remnant or survivors of them (CD 2:5-7).

The remnant concept becomes, for the sectarians, a means of affirming elect status solely on the basis of adherence to certain norms. Even though non-Essenic Israelites are still alive, their claim on elect status is ignored by the elect group. There is no suggestion that the Essenes are an actual physical remnant, the last of the Israelites. However, one must not rule out the possibility that the Essenes, in looking toward the end-time, did in fact envision themselves as the eventual physical remnant of the Israelites.

In general, there is a tendency in the use of the nominal forms to limit the elect group to the sectarians only. However, through the efforts of the sect group, as seen particularly in the War Scroll, there is the implied possibility that some non-Essenic Israelites may become part of the elect group in the eschatological future. Despite this possibility of election for the presently non-elect, there is an emphasis throughout the scrolls on separation of the elect from the non-elect. The non-elect group, frequently the rest of ethnic Israel as localized especially in Jerusalem, is identified as the center of "wickedness" and "impieties." By contrast, the elect group is characterized as the community of "truth" and "righteousness." Complete obedience to the precepts of the Essenes is the prime requirement for membership in the elect. An emphasis on ethnic background as alone sufficient to guarantee elect status is practically non-existent. Only in 4QDibHam is the elect group consistently identified as ethnic Israel. (This same phenomenon was noted with respect to the various verbal occurrences in 4QDibHam.) However, in all the documents a minimal ethnic requirement is assumed even to be eligible for elect status; only Israelites could become members of the sect group.[1] There is no evidence, apart from some usages of יחד , that the elect status was limited to males only.

---

[1] Some scholars have translated גר (CD 14:4, 6) as "proselyte" (gentile convert). See Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, p. 159; and Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, pp. 68-69. However, the fact that the גר was listed as a separate category would seem to indicate that this person was not accepted as a full member in the sect. Vermès, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in*

There is no disagreement between occurrences of verbal forms and those of nominal forms regarding the identification of the elect group. In practically all cases, it is the Essenes who are considered elect. Even the major divergence from this general pattern, 4QDibHam, exhibits a high degree of consistency between verbal and nominal forms; it is ethnic Israel rather than just the sectarian group which is elect. Although the identification of the non-elect has been implied in some of the passages already cited, it is appropriate at this point to examine in some detail specific references to the non-elect.

Who is Excluded from Being Elect?

The principle of separation, as manifest in usages of בדל, is very helpful in defining and characterizing the non-elect. Nearly all references to the non-elect containing בדל are found in the Manual of Discipline. The elect are instructed to separate from "perverse men" (אנשי העול) (1QS 5:1, 10; 8:13; 9:9). In 1QS 5:18-20, the non-elect are defined as those who despise God's word.

> For all who are not counted in his Covenant shall be set apart, together with all that is theirs; and the holy shall not rely on any work of vanity. For they are all vanity who know not his covenant, and he will destroy from the world all them that despise his word.

English (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962), p. 17, dismisses this reference as incidental. He believes the גר mentioned in these passages is the same as the גר of post-biblical Judaism, namely, a gentile who had adopted some of the customs of Judaism without being in any sense a complete convert. He points out that in 1QS 2:19-22, only priests, Levites, and people are mentioned as the components of the elect community (the "New Israel"). Rowley, *Zadokite Fragments*, p. 35, believes that גר is the name for a Jewish recruit who is not yet a full member of the "New Israel;" he concurs with Vermes that the Essenes were not interested in foreign converts.

> All their deeds are defilement before him, and their possessions wholly unclean.

In two instances, the "perverse" non-elect are more clearly identified. The sectarians are told to separate from the evil-doers by fleeing to the desert (1QS 5:13; 9:20-21). In these references, the non-elect are obviously Judeans, particularly the leaders who are in Jerudalem. In another document, the elect are instructed to keep separate from the non-elect who are called "children of the pit" (בני השחת) (CD 6:14). This particular reference is included as part of a list of activities from which the elect must refrain. In all of these references, non-elect status is assigned because of the affirmation of certain beliefs and practices which are considered contrary to the "true" revealed word of God. Certainly, the non-elect category includes the גוים, but in the above examples it is the non-Essenic Israelites (specifically Judeans) who are the non-elect.

The non-elect are defined as the "wicked"; they have not delighted in all God's commands (as interpreted, of course, by the Essenes); they have chosen (בחר) what God hates.

> For they have walked in the way which is not good and have despised (fragmentary) their soul has detested your (fragmentary) and they have not delighted in all your commands and have chosen that which you hate (1QH 15:18-19).

In the Damascus Document, the non-elect are those in (ethnic) Israel who have ignored the paths of righteousness established by the forefathers; instead, they have chosen "delusions" (מהתלות) (CD 1:16-19). In other words, they have ignored the "truth" propounded by the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers. Therefore, these "wicked" of Israel have not been chosen by God from the beginning (CD 2:7). This is a direct attack on an ethnic definition of the elect. Finally, it is predictable that in 4QDibHam the non-elect are defined as the gentiles only (4QDibHam 4:5). With the exception of this reference, though, the identification of the non-elect in passages using בחר is closely related to that identification expressed in passages containing בדל . The basic conclusion to be drawn from the occurrences of the appropriate verbal forms is that the non-elect are those Israelites (especially those in Judah) who opposed the tenets of the Essenes either through direct persecution of the sect or through a general indifference toward the religio-ethical demands which the Essenes believed were incumbent on all Israel. Within the framework of this general conclusion, the paucity of references to the gentiles does not negate their automatic inclusion in the non-elect category.

Of the eight nominal forms applied to the non-elect, the only term used exclusively for the non-elect is גוי . In the final war, all the "nations" (גוים) will be defeated by God's elect, i.e., the sectarians; in addition, all of the wicked of the people Israel will also be punished by the hand of the elect (1QpHab 5:4-5). Much the same theme is present throughout the War Scroll. The "perfect of way" (another expression for the sectarians) will defeat all the "wicked nations" in the final battle (1QM 14:7; 15:1-2; 16:1). Nothing is said about the position of the "wicked Israelites," though, in these references. In 4QDibHam, too, the גוים are described as the non-elect. The people Israel have been given rank before the eyes of all the "nations" (4QDibHam 2:12; 3:5; 5:10-11). When the successor to David is on the throne, all the "nations" (the non-elect) will see God's glory as expressed through Israel (the elect) (4QDibHam 4:8). A fragmentary account of the same hope is found in

4QpIsa 10:17-20. Apart from these references in which the non-elect are defined primarily as the gentiles, there are several instances in which the "wicked nations" and the "wicked Israelites" are considered jointly as the non-elect.

> Its interpretation concerns the wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh who will seek to put forth a hand against the Priest and the men of his counsel in the time of trial that is coming upon them. But God will redeem from their hand and afterwards they will be given into the hand of the ruthless gentiles for judgment (4QpPs37 2:17-19).

In this passage, the גוים become the instrument of God's wrath against the non-elect Israelites. However, this does not in any way improve the non-elect status of the גוים. The term גוים is used consistently throughout the Essene literature as a designation for the non-elect.

On occasion, the nominal term ישראל is used as a designation for the non-elect group. (More often, the sect group sees itself as the "true Israel" as was suggested in the previous sub-section.) When the Wicked Priest got control over the people Israel, he abandoned God and betrayed his laws (1QpHab 8:9-10). Although it is not spelled out precisely, it is apparent that the sectarians regarded those in Israel who passively accepted the leadership of the Wicked Priest to have forfeited any claim to membership in the elect. In the Manual of Discipline the knowledge of God's precepts available to the Essenes has been hidden from Israel because of the fear of apostasy on their part.

> . . . they (the initiates) shall be set apart as holy within the Council of the members of the Community; and let nothing of that which was hidden from Israel, but found by the Man who sought, be hidden from them out of fear of apostasy (1QS 8:11-12).

Without the understanding of God's will, the non-elect member can not lead the exemplary life which is required for inclusion in the elect group. Psalm 37:21-22 is interpreted as meaning that the "wicked ones of Israel" will be cut off and destroyed forever at the time of judgment (4QpPs37 3:10-12). It would seem that notall Israel is necessarily included in this condemnation, but the passage also indicates that only the "congregation of poor ones" (the Essenes) are the elect who will possess the earth. In another document, it is affirmed that a few faithful out of ethnic Israel will come to join the "true Israel" (the Essenes) at the end-time, but, in the meantime, false leaders are leading Israel astray (4QpNah 3:4-5). The mood expressed in the Damascus Document is one of general condemnation of the people Israel because of their apostasy from the laws of God. The people Israel have listened to the "man of scoffing" (איש הלצון) who preaches falsehood, and he has led them astray from the righteousness of the fathers (CD 1:13-16). The situation is so bad that the sectarians have to convert from the wicked ways of Israel before being considered part of the elect (CD 6:5; 8:16; 19:29). Belial, the Prince of Darkness, shall be free to wreak his havoc on Israel until the end of the age (CD 4:13-14). The position of Israel in all the references cited so far is rather bleak. Israel is no longer elect; the people have lost their position as God's favorites in the world. Predictably, all references to ישראל in 4QDibHam portray the גוים (the gentiles) as the non-elect; the people Israel still have a claim on their special elect status (cf. 4QDibHam 2:11; 4:9; 5:7, 11). A typical example is found in 4QDibHam 3:5-6: "You have given us rank before the eyes of all the nations. You have called Israel 'my first-born son' and you have chastized him as one chastizes his son."

The non-elect group, as illustrated by the occurrences of סוד, is comprised, in every case, of non-Essenes who are part of Israel. The non-Essenes are called an "assembly of flesh" (סוד בשר) (1QS 11:7, 9) and even as "assembly of worms" (סוד רמה) (1QS 11:10). The emphasis on "flesh" is particularly revealing. The Essenes regarded themselves as having risen above the claims of the flesh to a life of the spirit. This terminology just serves to underscore the expressed division between the sectarians and the rest of Israel. In the Hymn Scroll, the non-elect are often given a double definition which includes both סוד and עדה . The non-Essenes are an "assembly of vanity" (סוד שוא) and a "congregation of Belial" (עדת בליעל) (1QH 2:22); they are an "assembly of violence" (סוד חמס) and an "assembly of vanity" (סוד __א)[1] (1QH 6:5); the non-elect are an "assembly of hypocrites" (סוד נעלמים) and a "congregation of vanity" (עדת שוא) (1QH 7:34). Along with the graphic portrayal of the non-elect, it is interesting to note the use of שוא with both סוד and עדה.

The nominal form עדה, like סוד, is used to define non-Essenic Israelites as the non-elect. A false preacher led many of the people astray when he founded a "congregation on deceit" (עדה בשקר). Those who have followed him will be liable to the judgment of fire (1QpHab 10:9-13). The same theme is present in CD 8:13 // 19:26; the wrath of God was kindled against the whole congregation which listened to the lies of their preacher. The Hymn Scroll contains a reference to the non-elect as the "congregation of those who seek smooth things" (עדת דורשי הלקות); this phrase is parallel to the phrase "interpreters of falsehood" (מליצי כזב) (1QH 2:31-32). This passage illustrates clearly the delineation of elect from non-elect. The latter represent those opponents of the Essenes who interpreted the scriptures in ways totally anathema to the celebrants of the "new Israel." Particularly graphic is the description of the non-elect in the Isaiah Commentary. They are the "congregation of the Men of Scoffing" (עדת אנשי הלצון) in Jerusalem who have rejected the law of God. Therefore, the anger of the Lord has been kindled against them; even yet, he continues to smite them (4QpIsa 2:6-10). Apart from these various references to the people Israel as non-elect, there is one reference to the gentiles as non-elect. The "nations," along with the forces of Belial, are described as a "wicked congregation" (עדת רשעה) which will be crushed by the elect in the final battle (1QM 15:2-3, 9). Overall, though, the non-elect, as specified in usages of both עדה and סוד , are defined as non-repentant Israelites (those who reject the "truth" as promulgated by the Essenes).

---

[1] The ש and ו of שוא are missing, but it is quite clear that this is the word intended since the phrase עדת שוא occurs in 1QH 7:34.

Another way the non-elect are defined is through the use of עם . Those of God's people who have not hearkened to the words of the Teacher of Righteousness will face a dismal future at the time of the last generations because of their disbelief (1QpHab 2:1-10). This category of the non-elect includes not only those who rejected the Teacher completely, but it also includes those who were members of the sect and had fallen away. In 1QpHab 5:4-5, the non-elect includes the wicked of God's people. They, along with the gentiles, will be punished by the elect in the last days.

> The explanation of this word is that God will not destroy his people by the hand of the nations, but God will judge all the nations by the hand of his elect. And it is by the punishment which the elect will dispense that all the wicked of his people will atone, because they (the elect) have kept his commandments in their distress.

A major theme in the Hymn Scroll is that God's people have been led astray by "false interpreters" (1QH 2:19; 4:6, 11, 16). In the Damascus Document a faithful sectarian is one who avoids the ways of the people Israel; he must even witness against the people in order to fulfill God's will (CD 8:16-17 // 19:29-30). The people have no knowledge of what is required to be members of the elect (CD 5:15-16). Only in 4QDibHam does the ancient writer fail to identify the people (Israel) as non-elect. In that document Israel is loved more than all the עמים (i.e., gentiles) (4QDibHam 4:5).

The nouns פליטה and שארית should be considered together since all the relevant occurrences of the former are found in passages which also contain the latter form. Thus, all the wicked will be crushed without "remnant" (שארית) or "survivors" (פליטה); this is true whether the wicked are non-elect Israelites (1QS 4:14), fallen away Essenes (CD 2:5-7), or a mixture of Israelites and gentiles (1QM 1:6-7).[1] However, שארית appears alone in passages which indicate the non-elect status of the wicked. Those who are not counted in God's covenant (i.e., non-Essenes) will have the curses of the covenant enacted against them; they will have no remnant (1QS 5:11-13). On one of the battle standards for the final war, the Essenes are to write that בליעל and all his forces will have no remnant (1QM 4:1-2). The gentiles as well as non-sectarian Israelites are to be destroyed without a remnant (1QM 14:5).[2]

The קהל , too, can be a designation for the non-elect. The sectarian expresses the hope that, in the future, a few faithful will flee their "assembly" which is dominated by the "seekers of smooth things," and they will join themselves to Israel, i.e., to the "true Israel" which is the Essenic community (4QpNah 3:5). The writer of this commentary then affirms that, in the future, the קהל will not continue to be mislead. This may suggest a belief in the possibility of "mass conversion" in the future. However, for the present, the members of the קהל are considered to be non-elect until such time as the principles of the sect are obeyed. The קהל describes the gathering of the enemies of the sectarians in 1QH 2:29-30. These enemies are clearly Israelites who have rejected the teachings of the Essenes since, in the following verses, the sectarian gives thanks for his deliverance from persecution (1QH 2:31-33). A final reference to the non-elect occurs in 1QM 11:16. The last part of the line is missing, but in the first half it reads: ". . . judgments against Gog and all his assembly" (fragmentary) (1QM 11:16). This is a very curious reference. The term גוג does not appear elsewhere in the Qumran literature. However, גוג is a prominent character in apocalyptic literature. In Ezekiel 38-39 he is the chief of the evil forces who will wage war against Yahweh in a final cataclysmic battle. It is therefore quite appropriate to equate גוג with בליעל ; both are terms for the leader of the forces which will confront Yahweh and all his host, including the sectarians, in the final battle. The קהל of גוג, as a haven for the wicked, most likely includes "wicked Israelites" as well as gentiles.

---

[1] Undoubtedly, the "lot of Belial" in 1QM 1:5 was believed to include wicked Israelites as well as gentiles. See 1QH 2:22 where עדת בליעל is used to indicate Israel.

[2] This same reference also occurs in a fragment of the War Scroll found in cave 4 (4QM a 3).

There is no difference between the identifications of the non-elect in the examined nominal forms and in the verbal forms cited. It is apparent without any further amplification that gentiles are excluded from the elect group. Those who are ethnically Israelite have an opportunity to be included in the elect, but it is not axiomatic that this status be conferred. The overwhelming majority of occurrences examined demonstrate that being an Israelite was not sufficient; an additional commitment was required: to uphold the law; to learn the truth (as interpreted by the Essenes); and to enter into the "new covenant." Since the majority of Israelites were not prepared to make this commitment, they were automatically excluded from the elect group. Only in 4QDibHam is this definition of the non-elect avoided. In this document, all Israel is considered elect; the gentiles are the non-elect. In the rest of the scrolls, a great amount of space is devoted to defining the non-elect Israelites. They are characterized as "wicked, perverse, unrighteous." Especially bitter vindictive is directed against the leaders who have led the formerly elect people into the paths of sin. In particular, the leaders at Jerusalem are singled out as the instigators of this unpleasant circumstance. The hope is put forth, in several references, that the "simple" and the "humble" will abandon these callous leaders and turn to the ways of "true Israel." However, on the whole, non-Essenic Israelites are classified as non-elect along with the gentiles.

How Does One Become Elect?

At the very minimum, it is safe to say that being born an Israelite was an essential prerequisite for potential inclusion in the elect group. Being born an Israelite was obviously only a mere prerequisite, or eligibility requirement, to becoming part of the elect.[1] What is required beyond this is a conversion (an affirmation of new precepts and a new covenant) from the present corrupt way of life in "Israel." However, the Qumran scrolls contain no guarantee of continued elect status once one has become a member of the Essenes. Members of the sect were subject to continual scrutiny to make sure no violations of the sect's rules occurred. The Manual of Discipline, especially 1QS 6:24 ff., lists the various offenses which might cause the sectarian to be separated from the elect group. Many offenses, of course, required only a temporary separation from the elect group until sufficient penance had been made. Others were of sufficient severity to merit permanent exclusion from the elect group (1QS 7:1-2, 16-17, 22-25).[1] A permanent fall from the elect status could occur at any time.

---

[1] Only in 4QDibHam is there a significant exception to this general statement. Throughout this document, ethnic origin alone is described as sufficient to guarantee election.

There is an occasional affirmation that some non-Essenic Jews might, in the future, become members of the elect group. It could be said with some justification that these potential members of the sect were considered elect in theory even though this state of being had not been manifested visibly by their joining the Essenes. Nevertheless, even for these few faithful, a conversion to the truth of the sectarian teachings was expressly anticipated. "And when Judah's glory is revealed, the simple ones of Ephraim will flee from the midst of their assembly and forsake those who mislead them and join themselves to Israel" (4QpNah 3:5).

Through Whom are the Promises of Election Traced?

The patriarchs do not play any significant role in the Qumran literature as a source of election promises. In an historical summary, the sectarians are shown to be the remnant which is faithful to the commandments of God as were Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob through whom God established his covenant with the faithful in Israel forever (CD 3:2-14).

---

[1] See also CD 8:21-22 // 19:33-35, where permanent exclusion from the elect group is specified.

The only other reference worth mentioning also occurs in the Damascus Document, and it is a very curious one. The writer mentions the "House of Peleg" which went out from the holy city (Jerusalem) after the defilement of the sanctuary by "Israel." ". . . the house of Peleg who went out from the holy city and put their trust in God in the epoch when Israel sinned and made the sanctuary unclean, but they returned unto God" (CD 20:22-23). Peleg is mentioned in the Old Testament as an ancestor of Abraham (Gen. 10:25; 11:16-17). It is possible, therefore, that this is a cryptic reference indicating that the exiles, who were, of course, the Essenes, took with them the only legitimate claim to the election promises made to Abraham, a claim which sinful Israel had now forfeited. However, this is all in the realm of speculation; since the term "Peleg" does not appear elsewhere in the scrolls, it is impossible to check possible meanings with other references.

Allusions to the forefathers as sources of election occur in several documents. Because God remembered his covenant with the forefathers, he raised up the sectarians (priests and laymen) out of the wickedness of the people Israel (CD 1:4; 6:2; 8:17-18 // 19:30-31; 34 3:2:6). The sectarians are, therefore, the heirs to the covenant made with the fathers. "O God of our fathers, we will bless your name forever. And we are an everlasting people, and you made a covenant with our fathers and established it with their seed for everlasting ages" (1QM 13:7-8).

Moses is mentioned several times in connection with the observance of the commandments of the sect. The Manual of Discipline contains several perfunctory references to the law of Moses as the basis for the rules incumbent on all sectarians (1QS 1:3; 8:15, 22), but otherwise, the major emphasis is on the new precepts which the sectarian must follow. In the Damascus Document, the position of Moses is somewhat more prominent. God raised up the sect because Israel had disobeyed the commandments of Moses.

> And the land became desolate, for they spoke rebellion against the commandments of God given by the hand of Moses and also (fragmentary) and prophesied falsehood so as to cause Israel to turn away from God (CD 5:21-6:2).

The sectarians, of course, become the only true interpreters of the law of Moses. When the initiate joins the sect, he swears, by the oath of the covenant which Moses concluded with Israel, to return to the law of Moses (CD 15:8-10; 16:1-2). Apart from these logical connections of the sect with the law of Moses, there is only one other significant mention of Moses in the Qumran literature. God speaks to Moses and predicts the present maladies which have fallen on the people Israel because of their wickedness (22 1:11). Hence, in this case Moses is used to justify the present position of the elect vis-a-vis the rest of Israel.

The figure of David is rather shadowy. Apart from the sect's expectation of a davidic or royal messiah,[1] the only significant reference to David occurs in 4QDibHam. The people are reminded that God concluded an everlasting covenant with David and his descendants to rule over Israel. As part of this promise, the tribe of Judah has been chosen to be dominant over the other tribes (4QDibHam 4:5). Even this passage could conceivably have been used by the sectarians to bolster up the messianic expectation.

As might be expected, the Sons of Zadok are invoked as the basis for the existence of the present elect community. God chose the Sons of

---

[1] A study of Qumran messianism is beyond the scope of this dissertation. The reader is referred to several excellent studies. K. G. Kuhn, "Die beiden Messias Aarons und Israel," NTS, I (1954-55), 168-79; and R. E. Brown, "The Messianism of Qumran," CBQ, XIX (1957), 53-82.

Zadok to establish his covenant and ordinances forever.

> Words of blessing for the man (fragmentary) the sons of Zadok the priests whom God has chosen to establish his covenant forever (and to test) all his ordinances in the midst of his people and to instruct them according to his command (1QSb 3:22-23).

The significance of the Zadokites is traced back to the time of Aaron (1QM 17:3). This emphasis served several functions for the sectarians. It solidified their claim of having the only legitimate priestly house in Israel. (This distinguished them from the "false" Hasmonean priesthood in Jerusalem.) It also gave the authority of antiquity to the rules and regulations which the Essenes felt were essential to being elect.

It is through the person of the Teacher of Righteousness that the present sect members find their greatest degree of assurance that they are elect. It was to the Teacher of Righteousness that God revealed all the mysteries of the prophets' words. ". . . the explanation of this concerns the Teacher of Righteousness to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets" (1QpHab 7:4-5). Through the work of the Teacher, the congregation (of the elect) was founded. "Its interpretation concerns the Priest, the Teacher of (Righteousness) whom God (commanded) to arise and he established to build for him a congregation. . ." (4QpPs37 3:15-16). Through him, God's will for the elect has been made manifest (CD 1:11-12; 20:27-34; 1QpHab 2:5-10; 1QS 8:11-12). In short, the Teacher of Righteousness represents, for the Essenes, the pivotal point upon which the elect of Israel are distinguished from the non-elect of Israel. According to one's response to his teachings, so is one judged to be elect or non-elect.

Generally, the Essenes appropriated as their own the figures common to all Israelites. Whether it was the forefathers or Moses, the patriarchs or

Zadok, the sectarians used them to bolster the present elect status of their own group over against the rest of Israel. But beyond these persons who were central to the history of all Israel, the sectarians elevated the Teacher of Righteousness to a prominent position as the new mediator through whom all the election promises of old were to be realized. This effectively eliminated from consideration as the elect all who did not subscribe to the tenets of the sect. It is very interesting that the majority of the allusions to past figures are found in the Damascus Document. The author of this document evidently felt a strong need to demonstrate the fulfillment of the "old covenant" through the enactment of the "new covenant." This is totally consistent with the emphasis in the document on the "new covenant" (CD 6:18-19; 8:21 // 19:33; 20:12).

By What Basic Concept is the Belief in Election Expressed?

Throughout the Qumran literature, entrance into the "covenant" (ברית) of the community is the primary way by which the sectarians express their identification as an elect people. Occasionally, as noted in the preceding section, allusion is made to the Mosaic covenant or the covenant of the fathers as that which unites the Essenic community (cf. 1QM 13:7-8; 1QS 1:3; 8:15, 22; CD 15:8-10; 16:1-2). More often, the covenant is described as a special one formulated by the sectarians themselves to meet their own specific needs; it is a "new covenant"[1] (based on new "truth" and new regulations) which is applicable only to the new elect community. The existence of this sectarian covenant is expressed in several different ways. Sometimes it is described in a very general fashion with no specific obligations for the elect mentioned. God has chosen the "just" and the "perfect of way" for an everlasting covenant (1QS 4:22); the sectarians are known as the "community of the everlasting covenant" (1QS 5:5-6); the soul of the sectarian seeks to cling to God's covenant forever (1QH 2:28; 4:39; 18:9); those who cling to the covenant are destined for eternal life (CD 3:20); the lay leader of the congregation is blessed in order that he might be the covenant renewer for the community (1QSb 5:20-21). The emphasis in 4QDibHam 4:5 is on God's covenant with David and his descendants as a guarantee of the continued elect status of Israel. In the majority of references to the covenant, though, it is mentioned in a context which includes the obligations incumbent on the elect within the bonds of the covenant. The elect group is composed of the "saints of the covenant" who are learned in the precepts (1QM 10:10). The covenant is established on the basis of these everlasting precepts (1QS 8:9-10). As the sectarian enters the "rule" of the community, so he passes into the "covenant" in the presence of God (1QS 1:16). Those whom God has chosen for an everlasting covenant are the sectarians who observe his commandments and thereby cling to his "holy covenant" (1QSb 1:1-3). The covenant member walks in the way of God's heart, and he is therefore part of the "assembly of the saints" (1QH 4:25). The role of the priests is particularly instrumental in guaranteeing the purity of the covenant. The Sons of Zadok have been chosen to establish God's covenant forever and to instruct the elect in the proper rules of the covenant (1QSb 3:22-23; 1QS 5:1-2).

---

[1] This precise term is more typical of the Damascus Document (cf. CD 6:18-19; 8:21 // 19:33; 20:12), but, in principle, it describes the covenant found in the rest of the Qumran literature.

A significant by-product of covenant membership is the barrier it erects between the elect and the non-elect. The sectarian separates from "wicked men" when he joins the covenant (1QS 5:10, 18; CD 6:14). Conversely, the wicked are described as those who have despised God's covenant and the commandments (precepts) which it entails (1QH 15:18-19). Errant sectarians are those who ignore the ordinances of the covenant (CD 2:6-7). They are excommunicated from the covenant of the elect (CD 8:1-2 // 19:13-14; 1QS 2:15-17). As for the sectarians who remain faithful, they shall receive the blessings of salvation, for God is faithful to his covenant (1QM 14:4-5; CD 20:27 ff.).

There is a wide-spread agreement within the various documents that being a member of the elect demands a specific response. Obedience of specific rules of conduct, as regulated within the framework of the sectarian covenant, determines whether an individual will remain a member of the elect group or not. The emphasis is mostly on the obligations laid on the sectarians because of their being elect; occasionally, however, reference is made to the covenant obligations placed on God.

Fate of the Elect and the Non-Elect

It must be remembered that the apocalyptic fervor of the Essenes makes it somewhat difficult to distinguish absolutely between what the sect considered as belonging to the present age and what it considered to be inherent in the final age. The sect saw itself as both the elect in the present age and as a prototype of the elect in the final age.[1] Nevertheless, some passages contain explicit references to the future.

With but few exceptions, beliefs about the disposition of the elect and the non-elect in the future follow the expected pattern. The elect

---

[1] See Cross, Ancient Library, p. 87.

(those who continue to remain faithful to sectarian teachings) will have a glorious future; conversely, the non-elect (including gentiles, non-Essenic Israelites, and fallen away sectarians) face a rather bleak future. However, the greatest amount of space is given in the scrolls to describing the horrible fate of the non-elect. In general, there is no significant difference between the various documents as to descriptions of the total destruction awaiting the non-elect. (There is, of course, differentiation between 4QDibHam and the other scrolls as to the precise identity of the non-elect.) Typical is the statement that God will destroy from the earth all the wicked who despise his words (1QS 5:18; 1QH 15:19-20). There will be no remnant left (1QS 4:14; 5:13; 1QM 1:6; 4:2). In the final battle, the forces of the non-elect (the hosts of Belial or the Kittim) will be given into the hands of the elect (1QM 11:9, 13; 14:7; 15:10; 1QH 4:25-26). In addition to these general predictions about the fate of the "wicked," there are specific passages which mention the fate of the gentiles only. God has called out the sword against all the nations (1QM 16:1); he will completely destroy the "assembly of the nations" (1QM 14:5). All the peoples of the land will be destroyed. "But you will put their fear upon your people together with destruction for all the peoples of the lands, to cut off at the time of judgment all who transgress your word" (1QH 4:26-27). However, this passage must be balanced against the statement in 1QH 6:12-13: "And all the nations shall know your truth and all the peoples your glory. For you have caused (them) to enter your glorious (covenant) with all the men of your council. . . ." This universalistic statement is the antithesis of the future predicted for the gentiles in the rest of the Qumran literature. Another passage in which the total destruction of the gentiles is not predicted is 4QDibHam 4:11. The "nations" will be allowed to bring offerings to the holy city, Zion, but there is no indication that they will be accepted as members of the covenant. Overall, the fate of the gentiles is not enviable.

Condemnation of non-Essenic Israelites and fallen-away sectarians is particularly pointed. Various maladies will fall on the wicked in Israel so that they will know that God's promises are true (22 1:11). All the wicked in Israel, as well as the "nations," will be judged at the hands of the elect (1QpHab 5:4); the wicked Israelites will be cut off and destroyed (4QpPs37 3:11-12); they will perish with famine and plague (4QpPs37 3:4-5). At the end-time, God's wrath will be kindled against Israel (CD 20:16). The fate of the Wicked Priest is also sealed. He will die a violent death because of his persecution of the sectarians (1QpHab 9:12; 12:3 ff.). The power of the "seekers of smooth things," too, will be destroyed; no longer will they mislead the common people (1QpNah 3:6-8).[1] As for the unfaithful sectarians, their fate is just as harsh as that of the gentiles or the non-elect Israelites. Those who do not hold fast to the covenant will be made extinct by Belial (CD 8:2 // 19:14); they shall not be counted as part of the elect group (CD 8:21-23 // 19:33-35; 20:25-27). Sometimes the punishment of these wicked sectarians is rather graphic. The backsliders will be destroyed with flames of fire by the angels of destruction; there will be no survivors (CD 2:5-7). The oath of initiation in the Manual of Discipline includes a clause which indicates that fallen-away Essenes will burn in eternal destruction; God will bring evil upon them; they will be cut off from the midst of the "Sons of Light" (1QS 2:11-16).

---

[1] It is not specifically stated that these false leaders will be destroyed, although one could imply such a fate with justification.

Overall, the fate of the non-elect is rather definite. The gentiles have comparatively few references devoted to them, and most of these are distinctly unfavorable in their predictions. Only two references offer even the slightest glimmer of hope that the gentiles might be saved from destruction in the final age. The greatest proportion of references to the non-elect describe the fate of non-Essenic Israelites or that of unfaithful sectarians. In other words, those who should have responded to the "truth" of the Essenes are severely castigated for their refusal to do so. The formerly elect, i.e., those in "Israel," have rejected the correct interpretation of God's law; therefore, the wrath of God will be kindled against them. Only those members of the covenant in good standing will escape the fate of the rest of Israel.[1]

By contrast to the fate of the non-elect, the elect are guaranteed a glorious future indeed. All who hold fast to the precepts (of the covenant) will triumph over all the inhabitants of the earth; the Essenes will know God's salvation (CD 20:27-34; 1QM 1:5; 11:13; 17:8; 4QpPs 37 2:5). The faithful sectarians are destined for eternal life (CD 3:20); they will arise in the last days (CD 4:3; 1QM 12:5).[2] The sectarians, by virtue of their obedience, become part of an eternal community (1QS 3:12; 11:8;

---

[1] One exception to this general statement is the reference to the "simple ones" (i.e., the few faithful non-Essenes) who will escape destruction in the last days by fleeing to join the Essenes (4QpNah 3:3-5). In fact, a case could be made that the few were not considered part of the non-elect in the first place. Though not members of the covenant community, nevertheless, they affirm principles espoused by the covenant community.

[2] These passages seem to refer to a belief in resurrection. This is not totally unexpected in the literature of an apocalyptic eschatologically-oriented sect.

1QH 3:21; 4:25; 1QM 13:7, 9). Particularly significant is a reference to the role of the Essenes vis-a-vis the rest of Israel. The "congregation of the poor" will inherit the mountain of the height of Israel, i.e., Zion (4QpPs37 3:11).[1] There may be temporary woes for the elect, even until the last days, but in the end they will finally triumph over all their adversaries (4QpPs37 2:9; 1QM 1:12). In the meantime, the sectarians are secure in the knowledge that God shows mercy to those who love him--even unto 1000 generations (CD 20:21). In all of these references, the basis of hope for the future rests on the premise that the elect will continue to remain faithful to the requirements of the covenant. Only 4QDibHam contains a deviation from this pattern. In the future, ". . . all the nations will see your glory--you who have been sanctified in the midst of your people Israel and for your great name" (4QDibHam 4:8-9). There is no requirement of covenantal obligations mentioned; the requirement of ethnic background is sufficient guarantee for God's grace in the future.

In general, there are more references to the fate of the non-elect, especially the Israelite non-elect, than to the fate of the elect. The sectarian writers are especially eager to justify the position of the sect with respect to the rest of Israel. With very few exceptions, there seems to be no indication that a rapprochement between faithful sectarians and the other Israelites was envisioned. On the contrary, such a reconciliation would seem impossible until such time as non-Essenic Israelites converted to the "truth." One gets the distinct feeling that the sectarians believed that under the present "wicked" leadership such a mass conversion would be unlikely. Consequently, the fate of the majority of the non-Essenic Israelites is considered by the Essenes to be scarcely more favorable than that of the gentiles. The document 4QDibHam, of course, is not to be interpreted in this way. In it the difference between the elect and the non-elect is ethnically derived. Consequently, there is no necessity for justifying the election claims of a particular group within the ethnic entity Israel.

---

[1] This would seem to be a prediction based on the belief that the true Zadokite priesthood would be reinstated at the Jerusalem Temple.

CHAPTER VI

COMPARISON OF THE DOCTRINE OF ELECTION IN BOTH LITERATURES

Occurrences of Election Vocabulary[1]

The number of total occurrences of the specified election vocabulary in the Chronicler's work and in the Dead Sea Scrolls is remarkably similar. For the former, there are 997 occurrences (208 verbal forms and 789 nominal forms); the latter contains 1008 occurrences (of which 313 are verbal and 695 are nominal). However, despite this near equality in total appearances, there is a vast difference between the two literatures in terms of the number of relevant vocabulary usages, i.e., occurrences which pertain to the doctrine of election. About one-third of the total occurrences of potential election vocabulary in the Chronicler's work actually pertains to election (337 out of 997). Over one-half of the total occurrences in the Essene literature is relevant to the doctrine of election (572 out of 1008 total occurrences). The really significant difference between the two literatures is found in the verbal occurrences. Only 1 out of 7 verbal occurrences in the Chronicler is relevant to election. For the scrolls, the corresponding figure is about 1 out of 4. The proportion of relevant nominal usages to total nominal occurrences is higher in both with about 4 out of 10 for the Chronicler's work and 7 out of 10 for the Qumran literature. The two literatures are fairly even in their division between references to the elect and the non-elect. About one-sixth of the relevant nominal forms in the Chronicler are applied to the non-elect. Roughly one fifth apply to the non-elect in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Overall, it is very significant that the writers of the Qumran literature made relatively greater use than did the Chronicler (or the writers of his sources) of the potential election vocabulary to convey the idea of election. In addition, the overall ratio of relevant election vocabulary occurrences to total vocabulary occurrences is significantly greater in the scrolls (2.5%) than in the Chronicler's work (1.2%). Careful perusal of the text of the Chronicler has convinced this writer that no words other than the specified election vocabulary were used in the Chronicler's work to convey the doctrine of election. On the basis of these findings, one has to draw the conclusion that, for the Chronicler, as well as for the writers of the various sources in Ezra and Nehemiah, the idea of election was emphasized less than it was by the writers of the Dead Sea Scrolls. This means that in all probability the Chronicler and undoubtedly his readers accepted their own elect status as a given entity inherited from the fathers--an entity which did not require a great deal of justification. For the Essenes, however, the question of their own elect status was of paramount importance. Claiming, as they did, that they were the only true successors to the election promises made to the fathers, they had a greater propensity to spell out precisely the nature of their elect status and how it was guaranteed. Consequently, there is a greater number of relevant occurrences of election vocabulary in the Qumran scrolls.

---

[1] See Tables 1-5 in the Appendix.

An examination of the various relevant usages, verbal and nominal, in each body of literature is very revealing. Relevant occurrences of the verbs ברך and לקח are found in the Chronicler's work, but not in the Essene literature. However, these two words have relevant occurrences only twice and once, respectively. Conversely, the verb חזק does not have a relevant occurrence in the Chronicler although it is used 14 times in the Qumran literature in passages pertaining to election. Both literatures contain relevant occurrences of 6 common verbal forms: אהב , בחר , בדל , ידע , פדה , and קרא . Neither contains relevant occurrences of the verbs גאל and קנה. The common verbs which are used most frequently in both literatures are בדל and בחר . The verbs אהב , ידע , and קרא are not used very often in the Chronicler to convey the doctrine of election.[1] Although used less frequently in both literatures, פדה is nevertheless very pertinent to election in both. However, in the Chronicler's work it refers to a people whereas in the scrolls it refers to the individual sectarian. The verb בדל emphasizes very pointedly the principle of separating the elect from the non-elect, a principle which is very conspicuous in both literatures even though the precise identification of the elect and non-elect differs in each. However, בחר is used rather differently in each literature. In the Chronicler, it is never the elect group which is the object of this verb. Rather, individuals (e.g., Abraham, David, the Levites) are chosen and, through their efforts, the people Israel are elect. By contrast, the Essenes are often the object of the verb בחר in the Qumran literature. These differences notwithstanding, the doctrine of election is conveyed very clearly through usages of בחר in both literatures. It is also very significant that the Essenic writers expressed their understanding of election more times through a greater variety of verbal usages than did the Chronicler or the writers of his sources. Of the 7 verbs pertaining to election in the Essene literature, 6 have relevant occurrences of 9 or more times per verb. By contrast, בדל and בחר have relevant occurrences of only 9 and 7 times, respectively, in the Chronicler; yet, together, they contribute more than half of the total relevant verbal occurrences in the entire work of the Chronicler. The absence of relevant occurrences of גאל and קנה in both literatures raises the question of their significance as election vocabulary. Admittedly, גאל is an important verb conveying the idea of election in Second Isaiah, but it is of no significance in either Deuteronomy or the two literatures under scrutiny. The most accurate assessment of גאל is that it has limited value for expressing the doctrine of election in biblical and post-biblical Hebrew. As for קנה, it is to be questioned whether this verb is actually part of the vocabulary of election in any meaningful sense. It is not relevant to the doctrine of election in either Deuteronomy or Second Isaiah (in addition to not being relevant in either the Chronicler or the scrolls).[1]

---

[1] There is only 1 relevant occurrence out of 39 total appearances of קרא in the Chronicler. The verb אהב has 1 relevant occurrence out of 3 total appearances. For ידע , the proportion is 2 out of 38 total appearances.

There is a greater disparity between the Chronicler's composition and the Dead Sea Scrolls in the use of different relevant nominal forms than was the case with the verbal forms. The writers of the scrolls used a much broader spectrum of nouns to express the doctrine of election.

---

[1] Further research needs to be done with respect to both גאל and קנה to determine their use as election vocabulary in other portions of the Old Testament as well as in non-Essene intertestamental works.

Thus, relevant occurrences of אביון , יחד , נחלה , סוד , and עד are found in the Qumran literature but not in the work of the Chronicler. (However, there are only 3 and 1 relevant occurrences, respectively, of נחלה and עד in the scrolls.) By contrast, only שאר has a relevant occurrence in the Chronicler without also having a relevant usage in the Essene literature. This single relevant occurrence indicates that apparently the writers of post-exilic literature preferred to use שארית instead of שאר as a term expressing the doctrine of election. The only noun not to have a relevant usage in either literature is סגלה . This absence of relevant appearances--in fact, the word only appears once in the Chronicler's composition and not at all in the scrolls--makes it likely that, for post-exilic Judaism, at least, סגלה does not appear to be a significant word in the vocabulary of election.[1] Of the words which writers of both literatures use in common, the Chronicler's composition contains only 1 relevant occurrence each for בחיר , עדה , and קדוש whereas, for all these nouns, there are a number of relevant occurrences in the Qumran literature. In actual practice, then, the nominal election vocabulary in the Chronicler's work is limited to 7 nouns (excluding those nouns for which only 1 relevant occurrence is found as well as those in which no relevant occurrences are found). For the Qumran scrolls, the corresponding figure is 14 (again excluding those nouns which have only 1 relevant occurrence or else none at all). This greater breadth of usage which is typical of the Qumran literature also extends to the use of various nominal forms as appellations for the non-elect. Eight different nominal forms are applied to the non-elect in the scrolls. Of these, only סוד does not appear also in the Chronicler. The other 7 nouns (גוי , ישראל , עדה , עם , פליטה , קהל, and שארית) have relevant occurrences in the work of the Chronicler, but only גוי and עם are used to refer to the non-elect. It is obvious, then, that the scrolls contain a greater breadth of nominal election vocabulary than does the Chronicler's work. The next question then becomes whether the writers of the scrolls used nominal vocabulary in ways not witnessed in the Old Testament literature.

---

[1] The reference to ישראל as God's סגלה(Ps. 135:4) is most likely to be placed in the earliest post-exilic period. See Weiser, The Psalms: A Commentary, trans. by Herbert Hartwell (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 788-89. No other post-exilic occurrences of סגלה are pertinent to the doctrine of election.

There is no essential difference between the way the writers of the scrolls used election vocabulary such as בחיר , נחלה , עדה, קדוש , and עד, and the way these words were used by Old Testament writers other than the Chronicler. (None of these nouns is of any significance as election vocabulary in the Chronicler's work.) No distinctive pattern emerges as to which particular documents in the Old Testament are most similar to the scrolls in terms of the relevant usages of these nouns. The nouns בחיר and עד serve as significant election vocabulary in Second Isaiah, but this is not true in Deuteronomy. In contrast, בחיר is used to express the doctrine of election in Deuteronomy, but the word is not significant in Second Isaiah. While not important as election vocabulary in either Deuteronomy or Second Isaiah, קדוש and עדה are very important as expressions of election in various priestly writings of the post-exilic community.

The Essenes gave an entirely new dimension to the nouns אביון , סוד , and יחד . These words are not part of the vocabulary of election in the Old Testament. These seem to be reflective of a particular "sectarian" self-understanding which is not present in the canonical documents.

The writers of the scrolls also used several words (which are part of the Old Testament vocabulary of election) in ways not attested in the various Old Testament documents. The noun ישראל is not used in the Old Testament as a name for the non-elect, but the word is used in this manner 12 times in the Essene literature. The term קהל, too, is applied to the non-elect by the Essenes; this usage does not occur in the Old Testament writings. Indeed, in the latter, the קהל is the post-exilic community in Jerusalem. This disparity between usages in the scrolls and the Old Testament indicates that קהל, for the Essenes, was not an exclusive cultically-defined entity as was the case in the Old Testament although, to be sure, it is assigned to the elect as well as to the non-elect in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

One final comparison of election vocabulary usage is illuminating. The only nominal forms used by the writer of 4QDibHam to express election are גוי, ישראל, and עם. This usage is much more akin to the relevant nominal usage in the Ezra and Nehemiah portions[1] of the Chronicler's work than it is to the "sectarian emphasis" present in the other documents of the Essenes. (To some extent, this judgment is also true of the priestly document 34 although it does not have such wide-spread usage of election vocabulary as does the document 4QDibHam; the terms יהודה and ישראל, for example, never appear in 34.) This vocabulary usage in 4QDibHam is totally consistent with the peculiarities of this document as noted throughout chapter five. In addition, the ratio of relevant election vocabulary occurrences to total vocabulary occurrences in 4QDibHam (5.1%) is significantly greater than the corresponding ratio in any of the other scrolls or in any of the three divisions of the Chronicler's work. The next highest ratio is found in 1QS and CD (both 2.9%). M. Baillet, who first published the photographs and transcription of 4QDibHam, believes 4QDibHam was written in the Maccabean period prior to the time of the Essenic sect per se even though the Essenes later used it as part of their "sectarian literature." In particular, Baillet contends that the lack of reference to the Teacher of Righteousness in 4QDibHam means that the text antedates the other scrolls. It is his opinion that this earlier date accounts for some of the differences between 4QDibHam and the other Qumran documents.[1] Unfortunately, Baillet does not deal specifically with vocabulary usage. Additional study of the origin of 4QDibHam, including paleographical analysis, is needed to determine the veracity of Baillet's contention. For the present, it is sufficient to reiterate that there is a significant difference between 4QDibHam and the remaining Qumran scrolls in terms of election vocabulary usage and election theology.

---

[1] These nouns comprise a sizeable proportion of the total relevant nominal occurrences in both Ezra and Nehemiah.

Identification of the Elect and the Non-Elect

In comparing the interpretations of the doctrine of election in the Chronicler's work and the Dead Sea Scrolls, it becomes readily apparent that the scrolls reflect a much more static definition of the elect and the non-elect than does the Chronicler's work. In the latter, there is an ambiguity, a lack of precision, about who is elect and who is non-elect. In the Qumran literature, with the conspicuous exception of the document 4QDibHam, the Essenes, i.e., those in good standing, are defined as the elect and, ipso facto, non-Essenes, including fallen-away sectarians, as the non-elect. This view of the elect and the non-elect is unequivocal. There is a certainty of definition which is not present in the Chronicler's work where there are several understandings of the composition of the elect and the non-elect groups. Definitions of the elect range from ethnic Israel to the group of returned exiles; therefore, potential definitions of the non-elect cover a wide spectrum from all non-Israelites, i.e., the gentiles, to Israelites who did not affirm the principles and practices of the returned exiles. However, the ambiguity of the Chronicler's work is strikingly apparent at the point of defining the non-elect. With but few exceptions, the reader of that historical work is left to discern for himself just who is non-elect. (There is no question that the gentiles are non-elect; in this, the writers of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles and those of the Qumran literature are in complete accord.) There is an obvious reticence to define Israelites as non-elect although certainly this must have been the understanding of election shared by the writers of Ezra and Nehemiah 7-10 (particularly) with regard to those "in Israel" who refused to follow the dictums of the returned exiles. By contrast, there was no such reticence on the part of the writers of the Essene literature (again with the exception of the writer of 4QDibHam). A graphic illustration of this difference between the canonical and sectarian writings is found in the use of nominal vocabulary as applied to the non-elect. The usages in the Chronicler's work are limited to גוי and עם, both of which are references to gentiles when describing the non-elect. In the Dead Sea Scrolls, a variety of words, including ישראל, is applied to the non-elect. In fact, the majority of references to the non-elect in the scrolls are aimed at fellow Israelites, especially the people of Jerusalem and Judah who were not members of the sect. Thus, what can be at most only perceived as an implication in the Chronicler's work is quite clearly spelled out in the Qumran scrolls.

---

[1] M. Baillet, "Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, Grotte 4: 'Les paroles des luminaires,'" RB, LXVIII (1961), 250.

Another major difference between the scrolls and the Chronicler's composition occurs with regard to the procedure by which one becomes elect. In the Chronicler's work, birthright alone is often sufficient justification for inclusion in the elect group. Where birth is not deemed enough to guarantee elect status, an additional affirmation of certain beliefs and practices may be required. However, this process of affirmation is relatively uncomplicated; no period of preparation is required prior to joining the elect. Compare this with the process involved in joining the Essenes. What can only be described as a "conversion experience" from "wickedness" to "truth," in sectarian parlance, was followed by an intensive and extensive period of preparation and probation before the would-be member was granted full rights in the elect group.

Despite the difference in the definitions of elect and non-elect, the writers of both the scrolls and the Chronicler's work shared some common presuppositions. One has already been mentioned; the gentiles are in no way considered to be part of the elect group. A second emphasis common to both is the necessity of separation of the elect from the non-elect. In the case of the scrolls, it is a separation from "wicked" Judeans as well as from gentiles. In the Chronicler's work, the separation is from gentiles at least and possibly from unrepentant Judeans as well. (Again, ambiguity in the Chronicler makes it difficult to be precise.) A third presupposition evident in both literatures, although it is not always articulated, is that the terms Israelites, or the people of Israel, or Israel, when these terms are referring to an ethnic entity, refer primarily to the people of Judah. The writers of both bodies of literature were the recipients of a bias which dated back to the time of the division of the kingdom at the death of Solomon. Simply stated, Judeans were convinced that they represented the true expression of what it meant to be elect. The Northern Israelites, though of the same ethnic stock, nevertheless lacked the full complement of essentials (such as the holy city, Jerusalem, the Temple, and the Zadokite priesthood and the davidic dynasty) to be fully elect in the same sense as the Judeans. It is within this framework that the Chronicler's work and the Qumran scrolls are to be placed. Jerusalem and Judah represent the central arena of activity in the Chronicler's work. In the scrolls, it is the "wicked" of Jerusalem and Judah who are the primary antagonists.

In terms of the conclusions just mentioned, and based on the research analyzed in chapters four and five, it is now possible to answer the first major research question posed in chapter one of this dissertation. The doctrine of election expressed in the work of the Chronicler is more inclusive than that expressed in the Dead Sea Scrolls. This conclusion is valid whether one uses the expressions of election found in Ezra and Nehemiah 7-10 or those found in Chronicles and the "memoirs" portion of Nehemiah as a basis for comparison with the scrolls. Certainly the writings found in Ezra and Nehemiah 7-10 are closer in intent to the more exclusivistic understanding of election found in the scrolls than is the case with the "memoirs" and Chronicles, but even the writers of Ezra and Nehemiah 7-10 stop short of the vitriolic diatribe against their fellow Judeans as being the non-elect which is typical in the Qumran literature.

Through Whom are the Promises of Election Traced?

With respect to this particular question, the most significant difference between the Chronicler's composition and the Qumran scrolls is the use in the latter of the Sons of Zadok and the Teacher of Righteousness as instruments through whom the promises of election are traced. Neither of these has an exact corresponding counterpart in the work of the Chronicler. Even the Levites never assume the same proportions, in terms of being guarantors of election, as the Sons of Zadok. Obviously, the sectarian self-understanding of the Essenic community depended directly on the special teachings of the Teacher of Righteousness. Possibly the teachings of the returned exiles, as seen in Ezra and Nehemiah 7-10, may have served to later generations of Jews as the basis for an elect status, but if this is the case, it is not articulated as is the role of the Teacher to subsequent generations of Essenes.

Apart from this major difference between the scrolls and the Chronicler's composition, there are some minor differences as well as some similarities in the two literatures. In the Chronicler's work, promises to patriarchs play an important role as the basis upon which later generations can understand their own election. (Only the book of Ezra omits any reference to the patriarchs.) By contrast, the patriarchs play a very minimal role in the Essene literature. Furthermore, the role of David, as portrayed by the writers of the scrolls, is very insignificant. Only the author of 4QDibHam assigns to David and his dynasty the role of election guarantor which is so typical of Chronicles. The remaining scrolls reflect a lack of interest in David which is more typical of the Ezra and Nehemiah portions of the Chronicler's work. It is interesting to compare the role assigned to Moses in the two literatures. Both Ezra and the Manual of Discipline contain rather perfunctory references to the law of Moses. The writers of each appear to be giving deference to the past without necessarily making their understanding of election dependent on any continuity with the revelation from Moses. The role of Moses in the Damascus Document, Nehemiah, and Chronicles assumes a somewhat more prominent position with respect to the promises of election although it must be stressed that even in these documents Moses and/or the law of Moses do not provide the only foundation upon which election is based. Finally, rather general references to the forefathers as sources of election are found in all the component parts of the Chronicler's work as well as in the Damascus Document although this type of reference is not prevalent in the remainder of the Qumran scrolls.

Overall, one is immediately aware of the fact that the writers of the various sources within the Chronicler's work were more inclined to depend on links to figures in Israel's history as the basis for the election of the present group than were the writers of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Only the writer of the Damascus Document consistently links the elect status of the present group to past historical figures. For the writers of the rest of the scrolls, occasional homage to the past seemed quite sufficient. It is obvious that, from the standpoint of these ancient writers, the new dispensation, dependent primarily on the doctrine of the Teacher of Righteousness, alleviated any necessity for direct dependence on the past as a guarantee of the present elect status.

By What Basic Concept is the Belief in Election Expressed?

The primacy of the covenant as a means of expressing the fact of election is found both in the Chronicler's work and the Qumran literature. In both literatures there is an emphasis on the obligations incumbent on the elect people as a result of their membership in the covenant. This emphasis on the covenant obligations of the elect far outweighs any emphasis (in either of the two literatures) on the obligations of God in the covenant relationship.

Given the fact that the covenant serves as a major institution to express election in both literatures, there are some basic differences between the ways the covenant is envisioned in each. In the Chronicler's work, it is often the case that a covenant mediator (e.g., the king, or Nehemiah, or Ezra) serves in a special capacity to unite the people and God. This covenant mediator is, in a very real sense, the instigator who urges the people into a covenant, or renewal of the ancient covenant. In the scrolls there is no emphasis on a covenant mediator in quite the same sense as it is found in the Chronicler's work. The Teacher of Righteousness evidently served in the capacity of covenant mediator for the earliest Essenes, but after that initial period, subsequent generations of Essenes simply affirmed the continuing operative covenant. The covenant as portrayed in the Qumran literature is more static than that portrayed in the Chronicler's work. In the former, there is the covenant to which every initiate is admitted after the necessary probation period. There is no suggestion in the scrolls that the covenant (and its meaning) was ever changed in order to meet new conditions. By contrast, the various covenants in the Chronicler's work, although ostensibly renewals of earlier covenants between people and God, represent adaptations to changing conditions (e.g., the covenant arranged by Ezra reflects a necessity to speak to conditions caused by the exile and subsequent return). The tight community structure which was so typical of the Essenes contributed to the relative immutability of their covenant. Within the time-span covered by the Chronicler, there never was such a highly-organized, highly-structured covenant community. Even the covenant promulgated by Ezra was never so all-embracing in the life of the community as that of the Essenes. Of course, the community of the Essenes was always more homogenous, in terms of customs and beliefs, than were any of the covenant-making groups described in the Chronicler's work; this was also instrumental in producing a more static covenant.

A final difference between the two literatures is found in the way the various writers regarded their covenant as compared to previous covenants. As already mentioned, the various covenants in the Chronicler's work are presented as further extensions of previous covenants between the elect people and God. To some extent, this is also true of the covenant described in the Essenic community; the Essenes regarded their covenant as the fulfillment of the Mosaic covenant. Yet, there is an added dimension to the Essenic covenant. The sectarians regarded their covenant as reflecting a new dispensation--this is articulated especially in the phrase "new covenant"--which went beyond the confines of the old covenant, establishing the Essenes in a new relationship to God.

Fate of the Elect and the Non-Elect

The Essenes were much more concerned about the future than were the various writers in the Chronicler's work. This is to be expected considering the apocalyptic orientation of the sect. (Thus, e.g., one whole document, the War Scroll, is devoted to the anticipated future of both the elect and the non-elect.) What is spelled out very carefully in the Qumran literature must, of necessity, be implied on the basis of what is actually present in the various portions of the Chronicler's work.

The fate of the elect in both literatures is very favorable. In the Chronicler's work, it is presumed that the elect group will continue to survive so long as its members cleave to the laws of God. In the scrolls, too, this necessity of obedience to the laws of God is emphasized as a precondition for the survival of the elect. However, whereas the Old Testament writers are somewhat ambiguous about how one remains a member of the elect group, the Essenic writers are quite clear about how one remains a part of the saved elect.

The major point of divergence between the two literatures occurs in defining the fate of the non-elect. On the whole, the writers of the canonical work exhibited little sustained interest in the fate of the non-elect. After demanding that the elect separate from the non-elect, these writers were quite content, with but few exceptions, to let the non-elect go their own way, without any further definition of their ultimate fate. The Essenes, by contrast, were quite graphic in their descriptions of the terrible fate in store for the non-elect.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

It has been demonstrated that there is a significant difference between the doctrine of election as expressed in the Chronicler's work and that expressed in the Dead Sea Scrolls. This difference is manifest in a variety of ways.

The writers of the scrolls expressed their understanding of election more times through a greater variety of Hebrew words, verbal and nominal, than did the Chronicler or the writers of his sources.

The doctrine of election in the Chronicler's work is more inclusive than that found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the scrolls, only the Essenes (who represent only a portion of the totality of ethnic Israelites) are considered to be elect. Gentiles and non-Essenic Israelites are portrayed as non-elect. (The only exception to this general statement is the document 4QDibHam in which only gentiles are non-elect.) Only through "conversion" to the tenets of the Essenes can an Israelite become a member of the elect group. In the Chronicler's work, there is a reticence to define Israelites as non-elect although this implication is present (but not actually articulated) in Ezra and Nehemiah 7-10. In the rest of the Chronicler's work, ethnic background, i.e., being born an Israelite, is often the only criterion necessary for inclusion in the elect group.

In both literatures, reference is made to past figures in Israelite history (e.g., the patriarchs, the fathers, Moses, David) as the guarantors of the present elect status. However, in the Qumran literature, the "Sons of Zadok" (members of the Zadokite priesthood) and the "Teacher of Righteousness" also serve as instruments through whom the elect status is guaranteed. Neither of these has an exact corresponding counterpart in the work of the Chronicler.

The covenant serves as the primary means of expressing the fact of election in both literatures. In both, the covenant obligations of the elect far outweigh any emphasis on the obligations of God. However, the covenant as portrayed in the Qumran literature is more static than that portrayed in the Chronicler's work; there is no indication that the covenant was ever changed in order to meet new conditions. By contrast, the various covenants portrayed in the Chronicler's work represent adaptations to changing conditions. Furthermore, these covenants were never so all-embracing in the life of the community as that described in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Finally, the Essenes were much more concerned about the fate of the elect and the non-elect than were the various writers in the Chronicler's work. The fate of the elect in both literatures is favorable although there is much more concern in the scrolls about how one remains a member of the elect group. Generally, there is little interest in the fate of the non-elect in the canonical work. By comparison, the Essenic writers were quite graphic in describing the non-elect and the terrible fate in store for them.

Having stated these general conclusions, what follows will be an attempt to suggest the value of this dissertation for present discussions in biblical studies. This dissertation represents an attempt to further the understanding of a particular doctrine and its vocabulary in pre-Mishnaic Hebrew literature. A systematic word study of the vocabulary of election has been lacking in previous studies. There is, of course, still much refinement needed for a more precise understanding of just what "marginal words" (e.g., קנה , סגלה) should be included as part of election vocabulary. Nevertheless, this dissertation makes a further contribution to present knowledge in biblical theology.

A second way in which the results of this dissertation can be utilized is to further present understanding of that tremendously complex phenomenon, Palestinian Jewish sectarianism. The use of special election vocabulary by the writers of the scrolls helps to establish in yet another way some of the characteristics of the Jewish sect. A clear picture of Palestinian Judaism is still emerging, but, at the very minimum, it can be said that vocabulary analysis in this dissertation shows a distinct difference between a "sectarian" expression of election and various "canonical expressions" of election (including the Chronicler's work, Deuteronomy, and Second Isaiah); awareness of this difference adds to present knowledge about the categories of "canonical" and "sectarian" literatures. Further, the Essenes, as one sect within this broad spectrum, are described a little more precisely as a result of this dissertation.

As a result of this dissertation, further areas of research become evident. As has been mentioned, there is still work to be done in further defining the broadest limits of the Hebrew vocabulary of election. The debate about what constitutes the vocabulary of election still continues. Further study in the intertestamental literature as well as in the Mishnaic and even Talmudic literature is necessary in terms both of the doctrine of election itself and of the vocabulary (both biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew) which is used to express this doctrine. Research questions should be aimed at the following types of comparisons: Is there a difference between canonical (i.e., Old Testament) expressions of election and rabbinic expressions of election? What vocabulary similarities and differences exist? Is the vocabulary usage and the expression of election in the Dead Sea Scrolls similar to that in other intertestamental (non-canonical) literature?

Apart from these comparisons, the question naturally arises as to what similarities and differences exist between the Essenic community and the early Jewish Christian community with respect to the doctrine of election. The nature of the sources presently available makes a linguistic analysis in this area somewhat more difficult. In addition, there is still no clear agreement as to what literature may be attributed to the early Jewish Christians. Nevertheless, much work remains to be done with respect to determining the possible sectarian nature of the earliest Jewish Christian community. Indeed, since this community fits into the broad spectrum of sectarianism in the first century A.D., a comparison of the expression of election of the Essenes with that of the Jewish Christians would be highly beneficial both to a further understanding of Palestinian sectarianism and to a better understanding of primitive Christianity.

Finally, more research is called for with regard to the origins and use of the document 4QDibHam. It is important to ascertain why this document differs so markedly from the rest of the Qumran scrolls.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

OCCURRENCES OF SPECIFIED ELECTION VOCABULARY IN THE CHRONICLER'S WORK
(Verbal Forms)

Verbal Forms	Total Occurrences	Relevant Occurrences			
		Total	Chronicles[a]	Ezra	Nehemiah
Total	208	26	15	4	7
אהב	3	1			1
בדל	13	9	2	4	3
בחר	23	7	6		1
ברר	4	2	2		
גאל					
חזק	42				
ידע	38	2	1		1
לקח	39	1	1		
פדה	3	3	2		1
קנה	4				
קרא	39	1	1		

[a] Excluding I Chronicles 1-9.

TABLE 2

OCCURRENCES OF SPECIFIED ELECTION VOCABULARY IN THE CHRONICLER'S WORK (Nominal Forms)

Nominal Forms	Total Occurrences	Relevant Occurrences					
		Total	Elect	Non-Elect	Chronicles[a]	Ezra	Nehemiah
Total	789	311	262	49	224	47	40
אביון							
בחיר	1	1	1		1		
גוי	26	26	1	25	19	1	6
יחד	1						
ישראל	357	143	143		107	25	11
נחלה	4						
סגלה	1						
סוד							
עבד	96	7	7		4	1	2
עד							
עדה	1	1	1		1		
עם	231	79	55	24	55	10	14
פליטה	9	7	7		2	4	1
קדוש	4	1	1		1		
קהל	42	42	42		32	5	5
שאר	10	1	1				1
שארית	6	3	3		2	1	

[a] Excluding I Chronicles 1-9.

TABLE 3

OCCURRENCES OF SPECIFIED ELECTION VOCABULARY IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS (Verbal Forms)

Verbal Forms	Total Occurrences	Relevant Occurrences							
		Total	1QpHab	1QS	1QM	1QH	CD	4QDibHam	Others[a]
Total	313	89	2	25	8	26	16	6	6
אהב	23	10		3		3	3	1	
בדל	27	18		15		1	1		1
בחר	33	19		5	1	4	4	2	3
ברר	8								
גאל	1								
חזק	55	14		1	1	7	4		1
ידע	118	16	2		2	8	3		1
לקח	20								
פדה	7	3				3			
קבה	1								
קרא	20	9		1	4		1	3	

[a] This category includes: 1QSa, 1QSb, 22, 34, 4QpIsa, 4QpNah, 4QpPs37, 4QPB, and 4QFl.

TABLE 4

OCCURRENCES OF SPECIFIED ELECTION VOCABULARY IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS (Nominal Forms)

Nominal Forms	Total Occur-rences	Relevant Occurrences									
		Total	Elect	Non-Elect	1QpHab	1QS	1QM	1QH	CD	4QDib Ham	Others[a]
Total	695	483	375	108	17	88	83	69	87	21	118
אביון	16	13	13		3		3	5			2
בחיר	21	21	21		3	3	3	6	1		5
גוי	54	54		54	5		15	2	8	6	18
יחד	90	81	81		1	57		4	3		16
ישראל	139	115	103	12	1	13	12		42	8	39
נחלה	14	3	3				2	1			
סגלה											
סוד	44	20	13	7		8		10	1		1
עבד	35	22	22			1		21			
עד	6	1	1			1					
עדה	83	52	42	10	1	2	13	5	15		16
עם	111	56	48	8	3		15	8	11	7	12
פליטה	11	5	1	4		1	1	1	2		
קדוש	37	15	15				8	3			4
קהל	16	12	6	6			4	1	2		5
שאר	3										
שארית	15	13	6	7		2	7	2	2		

[a] This category includes: 1QSa, 1QSb, 22, 34, 4QpIsa, 4QpNah, 4QpPs37, 4QPB, and 4QFl.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF RELEVANT ELECTION VOCABULARY OCCURRENCES WITH TOTAL VOCABULARY OCCURRENCES IN THE CHRONICLER'S WORK AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

(Verbal and Nominal Forms)

Documents	Total Vocabulary Occurrences[a]	Relevant Election Vocabulary Occurrences			Ratio of Relevant Occurrences to Total Occurrences (Percentage)		
		Total	Verbal	Nominal	Total	Verbal	Nominal
Chronicler's Work							
Total	28,650	337	26	311	1.20	.10	1.10
Chronicles[b]	19,625	239	15	224	1.18	.08	1.10
Ezra	3,750	51	4	47	1.31	.11	1.20
Nehemiah	5,275	47	7	40	.88	.13	.75
Dead Sea Scrolls							
Total	22,800	572	89	483	2.50	.40	2.10
1QpHab	1,025	19	2	17	1.89	.19	1.70
1QS	3,850	113	25	88	2.95	.65	2.30
1QM	3,800	91	8	83	2.41	.21	2.20
1QH	5,500	95	26	69	1.77	.47	1.30
CD	3,550	103	16	87	2.95	.45	2.50
4QDibHam	525	27	6	21	5.10	1.10	4.00
Others[c]	4,550	124	6	118	2.70	.10	2.60

[a] All totals in this column are approximate.

[b] The genealogical lists (I Chronicles 1-9) are not included.

[c] This category includes: 1QSa, 1QSb, 22, 34, 4QpIsa, 4QpNah, 4QpPs37, 4QPB, and 4QFl.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Documents

Allegro, John M. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan*, Vol. V: *Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
Includes photographs and transcriptions for 4QpIsa, 4QpNah, 4QpPs37, and 4QFl.

________. "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXV (1956), 174-87.
Photographs and transcription for 4QPB.

Baillet, M. "Un recueil liturgique de Qumran, Grotte 4: 'Les paroles des luminaires.'" *Revue Biblique*, LXVIII (1961), 195-250.
Photographs and transcription for 4QDibHam.

Barthelémy, D. and J. T. Milik. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, Vol. I: *Qumran Cave 1*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
Includes photographs and transcriptions for 1QSa, 1QSb, 22, and 34.

Burrows, Millar, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, Vol. I: *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950.
Includes photographs and transcription for 1QpHab.

________. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, Vol. II: *Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline*. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951.

Kittel, Rudolph, ed. *Biblia Hebraica*. Revised by Paul Kahle. 7th ed. Stuttgart: Privileg. Wurtt. Bibelanstalt, 1951.

Rabin, Chaim, ed. *The Zadokite Documents*. 2nd ed. rev. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
Transcription for CD.

Sukenik, E. L., ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1955.
Includes photographs and transcriptions for 1QM and 1QH.

Zeitlin, Solomon. *The Zadokite Fragments*. Philadelphia: Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1952.
Photographs for CD.

Books

Albright, W. F. The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.

Allegro, John M. The Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Penguin Books, 1956.

Altmann, Peter. Erwählungstheologie und Universalismus im Alten Testament. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1964.

Bächli, Otto. Israel und die Völker: Eine Studie zum Deuteronomium. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1962.

Batten, Loring W. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Baumgartner, Walter, ed. Hebraisches und Aramaisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. 2 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

Black, Matthew. The Scrolls and Christian Origins. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.

Blackman, Phillip. Mishnayoth. Vol. VII: Supplement and Index. 2nd ed. rev. New York: Judaica Press, Inc., 1964.

Bonsirven, Joseph. Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ. Translated by William Wolf. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Braun, Herbert. Qumran und das Neue Testament. 2 vols. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1966.

Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

Bronner, Leah. Sects and Separatism during the Second Jewish Commonwealth. New York: Bloch Publishing House, 1967.

Brown, Francis; Driver, S. R.; and Briggs, Charles A. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Corrected reprint. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

Burrows, Millar. The Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: Viking Press, 1956.

_______. More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: Viking Press, 1958.

Charles, R. H., ed. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Vol. II: Pseudepigrapha. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Colson, F. H., trans. and ed. *Philo*. Vol. IX of the Loeb Classical Library. Edited by T. E. Page *et al*. 10 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929-41.

Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. *The Ancient Library of Qumrán and Modern Biblical Studies*. Rev. ed. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961.

________, and Freedman, David Noel. *Early Hebrew Orthography*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952.

Curtis, Edward Lewis, and Madsen, Albert Alonzo. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.

Dahl, Nils Alstrup. *Das Volk Gottes: Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums*. 2nd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963.

Del Medico, H. E. *Deux manuscrits hebreux de la Mer Morte*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1951.

________. *L'énigme des manuscrits de la Mer Morte*. Paris: Libraire Plon, 1957.

Driver, G. R. *The Judean Scrolls*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

Driver, S. R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. Rev. ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

Dupont-Sommer, A. *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Translated by G. Vermes. New York: World Publishing Company, 1961.

Eichrodt, Walther. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. A. Baker. 2 vols. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961-67.

Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

Epstein, I., ed. *The Babylonian Talmud*. 26 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1952.

Farmer, William Reuben. *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.

Förster, Werner. *Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times*. Translated by Gordon E. Harris. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1964.

Gärtner, Bertil. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.

Galling, Kurt. Die Bücher der Chronist, Ezra, Nehemiah. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954.

________. Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels. Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1928.

Hatch, Edwin, and Redpath, Henry A. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Reprint. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

Jacob, Edmond. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by Arthur W. Heathcote and Phillip J. Allcock. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1958.

Kapelrud, Arvid S. The Question of Authorship in the Ezra Narrative. Oslo: Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1944.

Keil, C. F. The Books of the Chronicles. Translated by Andrew Harper. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872.

Koehler, Ludwig, and Baumgartner, Walter, eds. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. 2 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1951-53.

Kraeling, Emil G., ed. The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri: New Documents of the Fifth Century B.C. from the Jewish Colony at Elepantine. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

Kuhn, Karl Georg. Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.

Lisowsky, Gerhard, ed. Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1958.

Marcus, Ralph, trans. and ed. Josephus. Vol. IX of the Loeb Classical Library. Edited by T. E. Page et al. 9 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951-58.

Martin-Achard, Robert. A Light to the Nations. Translated by John Penney Smith. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.

Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim. Vol. I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. He That Cometh. Translated by G. W. Anderson. New York: Abingdon Press, 1955.

Myers, Jacob M. Ezra-Nehemiah. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965.

________. *I Chronicles*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965.

Nemoy, Leon. *Karaite Anthology*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952.

North, Christopher R. *Isaiah 40-55: Introduction and Commentary*. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1952.

Noth, Martin. *The History of Israel*. Revised Translation by Peter R. Ackroyd. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1960.

________. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien.* 2nd ed. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1957.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. rev. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1948.

Phythian-Adams, W. J. *The Call of Israel: An Introduction to the Study of Divine Election*. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.

Rabin, Chaim. *Qumran Studies.* London: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Rackham, H., trans. and ed. *Pliny: Natural History*. Vol. II of the Loeb Classical Library. Edited by T. E. Page et al. 10 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1944-47.

Rad, Gerhard von. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962.

Roberts, Alexander, and Donaldson, James, eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. I: *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

________. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. V: *Fathers of the Third Century: Hippolytus, Cyprian, Caius, Novatian, Appendix*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965.

Roth, Cecil. *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.

Rowley, H. H. *The Biblical Doctrine of Election*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1950.

________. *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Esra und Nehemiah*. Tübingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1949.

Sachau, Eduard. *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus einer jüdischen Militär-Kolonie zu Elephantine*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinricha'sche Buchhandlung, 1911.

Sayce, A. H., and Cowley, A. E., eds. Aramaic Papyri Discovered at Assuan. London: Alexander Moring, 1906.

Schechter, Solomon. Documents of Jewish Sectaries. Vol. I: Fragments of a Zadokite Work. Cambridge: University Press, 1910.

Schonfield, Hugh J. Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., Ltd., 1956.

Schousboe, Julius. La Secte juive de l'alliance nouvelle au pays de Damas et le Christianisme naissant. Copenhague: E. Munksgaard, 1942.

Schürer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus. Edited by Nahum N. Glatzer. New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1961.

Simon, Maurice, and Slotki, Israel W., trans. Baba Bathra. The Babylonian Talmud. Edited by I. Epstein. 26 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1935-52.

Sundberg, Albert C., Jr. The Old Testament of the Early Church. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Thackeray, H. St. J., trans. and ed. Josephus. Vol. II of the Loeb Classical Library. Edited by T. E. Page et al. 9 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951-58.

Torrey, Charles C. The Chronicler's History of Israel. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.

________. Ezra Studies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910.

Weiser, Artur. The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. New York: Association Press, 1961.

________. The Psalms: A Commentary. Translated by Herbert Hartwell. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.

Welch, Adam C. The Work of the Chronicler: Its Purpose and Its Date. London: Oxford University Press, 1939.

Wildberger, Hans. Jahwes Eigentumsvolk: Eine Studie zur Traditionsgeschichte und Theologie des Erwählungsgedankens. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1960.

Zeitlin, Solomon. The Dead Sea Scrolls and Modern Scholarship. Philadelphia: Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1956.

Zöckler, Otto. The Books of the Chronicles. Translated by James G. Murphy. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 1877.

Articles

Albright, W. F. "A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabaean Age: the Nash Papyrus." Journal of Biblical Literature, LVI (1937), 145-76.

________. "On the Date of the Scrolls from 'Ain Feshkha and the Nash Papyrus." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, #115 (October, 1949), 10-19.

________. "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler." Journal of Biblical Literature, XL (1921), 104-24.

Avigad, N. "The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents." Scripta Hierosolymitana. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Vol. IV: Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Jerusalem: Magnes Press for the Hebrew University, 1958.

Bertram, Georg. "Ἔθνος." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. II. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.

Birnbaum, Solomon A. "The Dates of the Cave Scrolls." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, #115 (October, 1949), 20-22.

________. "The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, #13-14. Supplementary studies (1952).

Black, Matthew. "The Theological Conceptions of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, XVIII-XIX (1953-54), 72-97.

Brown, R. E. "The Messianism of Qumran." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XIX (1957), 53-82.

Brownlee, William H. "A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Pre-Christian Jewish Sects." Biblical Archaeologist, XIII (1950), 49-72.

Brunet, Adrien M. "Le Chroniste et ses sources." Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 481-508.

Buchsel, F. "Λυτρόω." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. (Already cited). Vol. IV. 1967.

Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. "Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times." Harvard Theological Review, LIX (1966), 201-11.

________. "The Development of the Jewish Scripts." The Bible and the Ancient Near East. Edited by G. Ernest Wright. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961.

________. "La lettre de Simon Ben Kosba." *Revue Biblique*, LXIII (1956), 45-48.

________. "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, #132 (December, 1953), 15-26.

________. "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXIV (1955), 147-72.

Danell, G. A. "The Idea of God's People in the Bible." *The Root of the Vine*. Edited by Anton Fridrichsen *et al*. London: Dacre Press, 1953.

Davidson, Robert. "Universalism in Second Isaiah." *Scottish Journal of Theology*, XVI (1963), 166-85.

Dentan, R. C. "Redeem, Redeemer, Redemption." *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. IV. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick *et al*. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Eichrodt, Walther. "Covenant and Law: Thoughts on Recent Discussion." Translated by Lloyd Gaston. *Interpretation*, XX (1966), 302-21.

Eissfeldt, Otto. "Partikularismus und Universalismus in der israelitisch-judischen Religionsgeschichte." *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, LXXIX (1954), 283-84.

Freedman, David Noel. "The Chronicler's Purpose." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXIII (1961), 436-42.

Fritsch, C. T. "Herod the Great and the Qumran Community." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXIV (1955), 173-81.

Galling, Kurt. "The 'Gola-List' According to Ezra 2 // Nehemiah 7." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXX (1951), 149-58.

Heaton, E. W. "The Root שאר and the Doctrine of the Remnant." *Journal of Theological Studies*, III (1952), 27-39.

Herntrich, V. "λεῖμμα." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. IV. (Already cited).

Herrmann, J. "Κληρονόμος." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. (Already cited). Vol. III. 1965.

Hoenig, Sidney B. "Book Review of Wm. R. Farmer's *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus*." *Jewish Quarterly Review*, XLIX (1958-59), 75-80.

Huffmon, Herbert B. and Simon B. Parker. "A Further Note on the Treaty Background of Hebrew Yāda'." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, #184 (December, 1966), 36-38.

________. "The Treaty Background of Hebrew Yāda'." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, #181 (February, 1966), 31-37.

Hulst, A. R. "Der Name 'Israel' im Deuteronomium." *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, IX (1951), 65-106.

Johnson, A. R. "The Primary Meaning of √גאל." *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*. Edited by G. W. Anderson et al. Vol. I. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953,

Katz, Peter. "The Old Testament Canon in Palestine and Alexandria." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLVII (1956), 191-217.

Kelso, James L. "The Archeology of Qumran." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXIV (1955), 141-46.

Koch, Klaus. "Zur Geschichte der Erwählungsworstellung in Israel." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LXVII (1955), 205-26.

Kuhn, Karl Georg. "Die beiden Messias Aarons und Israel." *New Testament Studies*, I (1954-55), 168-79.

________. "Ἰσραήλ." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. III. (Already cited).

________. "Nachtrage zur Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten." *Revue de Qumran*, IV (1963-64), 163-234.

Lacheman, E. R. "Can Hebrew Paleography Be Called 'Scientific'?" *Jewish Quarterly Review*, XLII (1951-52), 377-85.

________. "Hebrew Paleography Again." *Jewish Quarterly Review*, XLIV (1953-54), 116-22.

Lemke, Werner E. "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History." *Harvard Theological Review*, LVIII (1965), 349-63.

Levi, Israel. "Un écrit sadducéen antérieur à la destruction du Temple." *Revue des Études Juives*, LXIII (1912), 1-19.

Lewis, Jack P. "What Do We Mean by Jabneh?" *Journal of Bible and Religion*, XXXII (1964), 125-32.

Luther, Bernhard. "Kahal und 'edah als Hilfsmittel der Quellenscheidung im Priesterkodex und in der Chronik." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LVI (1938), 44-63.

Marcus, Ralph. "Pharisees, Essenes, and Gnostics." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXIII (1954), 157-61.

________. "The Qumran Scrolls and Early Judaism." *Biblical Research*, I (1956), 9-47.

Martin-Achard, Robert. "La signification théologique de l'élection d'Israël." *Theologische Zeitschrift*, XVI (1960), 333-41.

Marx, Alfred. "Y a-t-il une prédestination à Qumran?" *Revue de Qumran*, VI (1967), 163-81.

Mendenhall, G. E. "Call, Calling." *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. I. (Already cited).

________. "Covenant." *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. I. (Already cited).

________. "Election." *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. II. (Already cited).

Michaeli, F. "Elect." *Vocabulary of the Bible*. Edited by J. J. von Allmen. Translated by P. J. Allcock *et al*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.

Minear, P. S. "Church, Idea of." *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. I. (Already cited).

Morgenstern, J. "The Dates of Ezra and Nehemiah." *Journal of Semitic Studies*, VII (1962), 1-11.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. "'Ich' und 'Er' in der Ezrageschichte." *Verbannung und Heimkehr: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie Israels im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr*. Edited by Arnulf Kuschke. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1961.

North, Robert. "The Damascus of Qumran Geography." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, LXXXVII (1955), 34-48.

________. "The Qumran 'Sadducees'." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XVII (1955), 164-88.

Orlinsky, Harry M. "Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: The Septuagint Text." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVIII (1959), 26-33.

Otzen, B. "Die neugefundenen Hebräischen Sektenschriften und die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen." *Studia Theologica*, VII (1953), 125-57.

Pavlovsky, V. "Die Chronologie der Tätigkeit Esdras Versuch Einer Neuen *Lösung*." Biblica, XXXVIII (19[illegible] 428-56.

Pope, M. H. "Congregation, Assembly." *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. I. (Already cited).

Procksch, Otto. "Ἅγιος." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* (Already cited). Vol. I. 1964.

Quell, Gottfried. "Ἀγαπάω." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. I. (Already cited).

________. "Ἐκλέγομαι." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. IV. (Already cited).

Rabinowitz, Isaac. "Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls and 'Damascus' Fragments." *Vetus Testamentum*, III (1953), 175-85.

Rabinowitz, L. "The First Essenes." *Journal of Semitic Studies*, IV (1959), 358-61.

Rad, Gerhard von. "Ἰσραήλ." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. III. (Already cited).

________. "The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles." *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Translated by E. W. Trueman Dicken. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

________. "The Tent and the Ark." *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*.

Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich. "Δοῦλος." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. II. (Already cited).

Richardson, H. Neil. "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles." *Journal of Bible and Religion*, XXVI (1958), 9-12.

Roberts, Bleddyn J. "The Qumran Scrolls and the Essenes." *New Testament Studies*, III (1956-57), 58-65.

Roth, Cecil. "The Jewish Revolt against the Romans (66-73) in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, XC (1958), 104-21.

________. "Were the Qumran Sectaries Essenes? A Re-examination of Some Evidences." *Journal of Theological Studies*, X (1959), 87-93.

________. "The Zealots in the War of 66-73." *Journal of Semitic Studies*, IV (1959), 332-55.

Rowley, H. H. "The Qumran Sectaries and the Zealots: An Examination of a Recent Theory." *Vetus Testamentum*, IX (1959), 379-92.

________. "Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple." *Bulletin of the John Ryland's Library*, XXXVIII (1955-56), 166-98.

________. "Some Traces of the History of the Qumran Sect." *Theologische Zeitschrift*, XIII (1957), 530-40.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. "Problems of the Books of Chronicles." *Vetus Testamentum*, IV (1954), 401-9.

Sandmel, Samuel. "Judaism, Jesus, and Paul: Some Problems of Method in Scholarly Research." *Vanderbilt Studies in the Humanities*. Edited by Richmond C. Beatty, J. Phillip Hyatt and Monroe K. Spears. Vol. I. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1951.

Schedl, Claus. "Bund und Erwählung." *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, LXXX (1958), 493-515.

Schmidt, K. L. "Ἐκκλησία." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. III. (Already cited).

________. "Καλέω." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. III. (Already cited).

Schrage, Wolfgang. "Συναγωγή." *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Vol. VII. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. 7 vols. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, Verlag, 1964.

Sellers, O. R. "Radiocarbon Dating of Cloth from the 'Ain Feshkha Cave." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, #123 (October, 1951), 24-26.

Smith, Morton. "The Dead Sea Sect in Relation to Ancient Judaism." *New Testament Studies*, VII (1960-61), 347-60.

________. "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century." *Israel: Its Role in Civilization*. Edited by Moshe Davis. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956.

Solomon, A. A. "The New Testament Doctrine of Election." *Scottish Journal of Theology*, XI (1958), 406-22.

Sonne, Isaiah. "A Hymn against Heretics in the Newly Discovered Scrolls and Its Gnostic Background." *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXIII (1950-51), 275-313.

Staerk, D. W. "Zum alttestamentlichen Erwählungsglauben." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LV (1937), 1-36.

Strathmann, H. "Μάρτυς." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. IV. (Already cited).

Strugnell, John. "Flavius Josephus and the Essenes: *Antiquities* XVIII. 18-22." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVII (1958), 106-15.

Sutcliffe, E. F. "Hatred at Qumran." *Revue de Qumran*, II (1959-60), 345-56.

Teicher, J. L. "The Damascus Fragments and the Origin of the Jewish Christian Sect." *Journal of Jewish Studies*, II (1951), 115-43.

_______. "The Dead Sea Scrolls--Documents of the Jewish-Christian Sect of Ebionites." *Journal of Jewish Studies*, II (1951), 67-99.

Toombs, L. E. "The Early History of the Qumran Sect." *Journal of Semitic Studies*, I (1956), 367-81.

Vaux, R. de. "Fouille au Khirbet Qumrân." *Revue Biblique*, LX (1953), 83-106.

_______. "Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire sur les 3^{e}, 4^{e}, et 5^{e} campagnes." *Revue Biblique*, LXIII (1956), 533-77.

_______. "La Grotte des manuscrits hébreux." *Revue Biblique*, LVI (1949), 586-609.

Watts, John D. W. "The People of God--A Study of the Doctrine in the Pentateuch." *The Expository Times*, LXXII (1955-56), 232-37.

Weingreen, J. "The Title Môrēh Ṣeḏeḳ." *Journal of Semitic Studies*, VI (1961), 162-74.

Wharton, J. A. "People of God." *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. III. (Already cited).

Wright, G. E. "Erwählung." *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Vol. II. Edited by Kurt Galling. 6 vols. 3rd ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1958.

Zeitlin, Solomon. "The Fallacy of the Antiquity of the Hebrew Scrolls Once More Exposed." *Jewish Quarterly Review*, LII (1961-62), 346-66.

_______. "History, Historians and the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Jewish Quarterly Review*, LV (1964-65), 97-116.

Zobel, Hans-Jurgen. "Ursprung und Verwurzelung des Erwählungsglaubens Israels." *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, XCIII (1968), 1-12.

VITA

Robert Grant Rogers was born in Columbus, Ohio, on April 13, 1938. He was reared in Columbus, Ohio, where he resided with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. William T. Baird. He attended public schools in Columbus and graduated from North High School in 1956. He received the B.S. degree in Social Welfare from Ohio State University in 1960. He was married to Gretchen Lalendorf in 1960; they moved to Boston, Massachusetts where he attended the Boston University School of Theology. Having received the S.T.B. degree in 1963, he entered the Theological Studies division of the Boston University Graduate School. He spent the academic year 1964-65 in London, England, attending the School of Oriental and African Studies and the Institute of Archaeology within the University of London. Mr. Rogers completed his graduate work at Boston University and graduated with the Ph.D. degree in 1969. While completing his graduate studies he taught for one year at Wellesley College. He will be teaching at Newton College of the Sacred Heart, Newton, Massachusetts, beginning in 1969.